DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 163 286 08 CE 018 973

AUTHOR	Woodruff, Alan; And Others
TITLE	National Study of Vocational Education Systems and Facilities. Volume I. Technical Report.
INSTITUTION	Institutional Development Associates, Inc., Silver Spring, Md.; Westat Research, Inc., Rockville, Md.
SPONS AGENCY	Office of Education (DHEW), Washington, D.C. Office of Planning, Budgeting, and Evaluation.
PUB DATE	Oct 78
CONTRACT	300-76-0315
NOTE	190p.; Not available in hard copy due to reproducibility problems; For related documents see CE 018 972-975 ; Prepared in collaboration with Financial Systems Planners, Inc.
EDRS PRICE	MF-$0.83 Plus Postage. HC Not Available from EDRS.
DESCRIPTORS	Administrative Policy; *Facility Utilization Research; Federal Aid; Federal Legislation; Federal Programs; Federal State Relationship; Financial Support; Money Management; National Surveys; *Organization; Postsecondary Education; *Program Administration; Program Evaluation; Secondary Education; *State Agencies; State Government; Systems Analysis; Technical Reports; *Vocational Education

ABSTRACT

The major data and findings of a national study of vocational education systems and facilities are presented in this first of a four-volume report. Part I is organized as follows: chapter I describes the present and historical organization of state vocational education administration structures and identifies types of state agency relationships that have an impact on the formulation and implementation of policies and programs; chapter II summarizes the vocational education system in terms of types of institutions, operating characteristics of these institutions, and the patterns of governance and fiscal status of the programs administered by local education agencies; chapter III presents factors that have historically affected the use of state and federal funds in the expansion and operation of programs; and chapters IV and V describe the practices of the states and territories in the financing of facilities construction, equipment acquisition, and operating costs in different types of institutions. Part II contains three chapters: chapter VI describes the facility resources of the nation's vocational education system; chapter VII presents an analysis of the utilization of facilities; and chapter VIII describes the program offerings and admission characteristics of vocational education institutions. Part III consists of the concluding chapter, which discusses how new facilities and programs are planned and describes factors that affect the planning and decision making process in the use of facilities and resources. (Also available are the following related volumes: vol. II, State Vocational Education System Descriptions [CE 018 974]; vol. III, Methodology Report [CE 018 975]; and the Executive Summary [CE 018 971].) (JH)

ED163286

NATIONAL STUDY OF VOCATIONAL EDUCATION SYSTEMS AND FACILITIES

Volume I
Technical Report

Part I. Organization, Governance, and Financing of Vocational Education Systems

Part II. Description of Vocational Education Institution Operating Characteristics and Facility Utilization

Part III. Planning Activities of State and Local Agencies

October 1978

Prepared for the

Office of Planning Budgeting and Evaluation

U.S. Office of Education
Contract Number
300-76-0315
by

INSTITUTIONAL DEVELOPMENT ASSOCIATES, INC.
Dr. Alan Woodruff
Project Director and Principal Investigator

WESTAT, INC.
Martha Berlin
Russell Bucans
Denny Horan
Lance Hodes

FINANCIAL SYSTEMS PLANNERS, INC.
Frank Sanghart
Geoffrey Tully

CE 018 973

WESTAT, INC.
11600 Nebel Street
Rockville, Maryland 20852

INSTITUTIONAL DEVELOPMENT ASSOCIATES, INC.
Post Office Box 6384
Silver Spring, Maryland 20906

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

PREFACE

The vocational education systems of the 56 States and Territories, while having generally similar objectives, are characterized by such a broad array of State, Territorial, and local agency governance structures, delivery systems, and funding provisions as to make each virtually unique.

Until this study was undertaken, little was known about the character or magnitude of the differences in the nation's 56 State and Territorial vocational education systems. As this study progressed, it became increasingly clear that the voids in our knowledge about the characteristics of State and Territorial vocational education were substantially greater than initially imagined.

Not only did our a priori knowledge of the vocational education system fail to provide a basis for studying the impact of system variables on one another and on the performance of the system as a whole; but also it did not contain even a basic inventory of the variables whose characteristics needed to be identified before hypotheses of association could be formulated.

Therefore, the intended investigation of research questions relating to the impact of variables, individually and in combination, on the performance of the State and Territorial vocational education systems was readily replaced by an attempt to provide an introductory description of these existing systems.

The following report does not seek to answer questions about the quality of vocational education services, nor does it attempt to specify the factors affecting the performance of these systems. Rather, it is intended solely to provide a description of some of the major characteristics of these systems. While data secured in the conduct of this study are sufficient to answer some of the research questions which were posed, most of the data indicated the existence of more significant dimensions to the vocational education systems than could be adequately treated in this report. Therefore, those who use material contained herein are advised to use it as reference documentation only. Also, readers are strongly cautioned against using it as the basis for definitive conclusions about the systems and agencies studied.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

We wish to express our sincere appreciation to those who have provided assistance and guidance in the development and administration of this study and in the analysis of study results.

Throughout this study we were fortunate to have the support and guidance of the Office of Planning, Budgeting and Evaluation in the persons of Dr. Robert Maroney, Director of the Occupational Handicapped and Developmental Programs Division; Edward Rattner, project officer during the final stages of this study; and, most especially, Dr. Robert C. Hall who served as project officer during the development of this study and whose support and guidance made immeasurable contributions to this project.

We are also deeply indebted to the members of our advisory committee, Drs. Frank Banghart, Robert Taylor, and Hugh Reid, and our technical review committee, Drs. Bob Childers, Gordon Swanson, and Robert Seckendorf, for their invaluable insights and critiques.

Major contributions to this effort were also made by Drs. Leroy Cornelson of the Bureau of Occupational and Adult Education and Robert Morgan of the National Center for Education Statistics who assisted in the identification of critical issues and provided much support in this study.

Special appreciation is also expressed to the more than 100 State agency officials who participated in this study and the over 9,000 local education agencies who provided responses to our survey and without whose cooperation this study could not have succeeded.

Finally, much of the credit for the success of this project goes to Ms. Martha Berlin, director of field activities, Ms. Denny Horan, data preparation supervisor, Ms. Arlene Shykind, editor, and Jack Rogers and Bernard Kaplan, consultants.

Dr. Alan P. Woodruff
Project Director and
Principal Investigator

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Chapter		Page
	SUMMARY AND RECOMMENDATIONS	xv
	State Governance of Vocational Education	xv
	Local Vocational Education Programs	xv
	Vocational Education Program Financing	xvi
	Vocational Education Facility Resource Distribution and Utilization	xvii
	Recommendations for Further Studies	xix
	State Agency Policy and Governance	xix
	Local Agency Governance Structures and Fiscal Agencies	xx
	Financing Vocational Education	xxi
	Facility Distribution and Utilization	xxi
	BACKGROUND, PURPOSE, AND OBJECTIVES	xxiii
	Background	xxiii
	Purpose of Study	xxiv
	Discussion of Study Requirements	xxv
	Study Objectives	xxvi
	Organization and Governance of Vocational Education	xxvii
	Financing Vocational Education	xxviii
	Status and Condition of the Vocational Education System	xxviii
	Planning	xxix
	Organization of Report	xxix
	Data Sources	xxx
	PART I: ORGANIZATION, GOVERNANCE, AND FINANCING OF VOCATIONAL EDUCATION SYSTEMS	1
I	STATE GOVERNANCE OF VOCATIONAL EDUCATION	3
	Organization of State Vocational Education System Governance Structures	5

TABLE OF CONTENTS (Continuec)

Chapter		Page
	Formal Provisions for Policy Formulation and the Coordination of Vocational Education.	5
	Primary Organization Structures.	7
	Composition of Governing Boards.	22
	Structured Provisions for Direct Agency Interaction	22
	Legislatively Established Coordinating Agencies.	22
	Role and Mission Statements.	33
	Informal Provisions for the Coordination of Vocational Education	33
	Changes in Organizational Structures	36
II	ORGANIZATION AND GOVERNANCE OF LOCAL VOCATIONAL INSTITUTIONS AND DELIVERY SYSTEMS	45
III	OVERVIEW OF FACTORS AFFECTING STATE POLICIES FOR THE FINANCING OF VOCATIONAL EDUCATION	67
	The Association Between Funding Policies for General and Vocational Education	68
	Impact of Vocational Education Act Funding Provisions on State Funding Policies	69
	Relationship Between Provisions for Funding Vocational Education Facilities Construction and Program Operations	71
IV	FINANCING FACILITIES AND EQUIPMENT FOR VOCATIONAL EDUCATION.	75
	Changes in Funding Policies and Practices.	75
	Limitations of Available Records	78
	Facility and Equipment Funding Procedures.	79
V	VOCATIONAL EDUCATION PROGRAM FUNDING MODELS	99
	The Leadership vs. Program Support Role of State and Federal Funds	100
	Impact of Funding Provisions on Local Vocational Education Programs.	101
	The Effectiveness of Alternative Funding Programs	102
	Vocational Education Program Support Policies and Practices	102

TABLE OF CONTENTS (Continued)

Chapter		Page
	PART II: DESCRIPTION OF VOCATIONAL EDUCATION INSTITUTION OPERATING CHARACTERISTICS AND FACILITY UTILIZATION.	121
VI	VOCATIONAL EDUCATION FACILITY RESOURCES	125
	Availability and Accessibility of Vocational Education Resources.	126
	Distribution of Vocational Education Institutions and Instructional Stations by Type and Region Served.	126
	Institutional Size Distribution -- Facilities and Enrollments.	130
	Condition of Vocational Education Facilities	133
	Adequacy of Facilities in Serving Physically Handicapped Students.	136
VII	THE UTILIZATION OF VOCATIONAL EDUCATION FACILITY RESOURCES. . . .	137
	Utilization of School Based Facilities	137
	Station Utilization During Regular Day Program.	138
	Operating Hours	141
	Use of Facilities on Alternate Schedules.	142
	Shared Resource Programs	142
	Resource Sharing Between Educational Agencies	143
	Shared Resource Between Public and Non-Public Educational Agencies.	145
	Use of Alternate Facilities for Vocational Education	147
	Use of Rental and Leased Facilities	147
	Purchase and Conversion of Non-Educational Facilities.	148
VIII	PROGRAM OFFERINGS AND ADMISSION CHARACTERISTICS OF VOCATIONAL EDUCATION INSTITUTIONS	151
	Institutional Program Levels Offered	151
	Admission Criteria and Schedules	153
	Admission Criteria.	153
	Admission Schedules	155

TABLE OF CONTENTS (Continued)

Chapter		Page
	PART III: PLANNING ACTIVITIES OF STATE AND LOCAL AGENCIES.	157
IX	FACILITY AND PROGRAM PLANNING PRACTICES	161
	Planning Processes and Priorities.	161
	Planning Data Requirements and Use.	161
	Program Review Practices.	165
	Factors Affecting Operating Schedules and Use of Alternative Facility Sources	167
	Operating Schedules	167
	Alternative Sources of Facilities	169

TABLE OF CONTENTS (Continued)

List of Tables

Table		Page
I	Distribution of Institutions and Instructional Stations in Secondary Schools vs. Population	xviii
II	Distribution of Institutions and Instructional Stations in Postsecondary Schools vs. Population	xviii
I-1	Summary of Provisions for Agency Interaction	6
I-2	State Board Types	11
I-3	State Agency Responsibility for Vocational Education	12
I-4	State Agency Authority Over Local (Vocational) Institutions	12
I-5	State Vocational Education Governance Structures	13
I-6	Provisions for Interagency Coordination Through Governing Board Memberships	25
I-7	Structured Provisions for Direct Agency Interaction for Vocational Education	29
I-8	Legislatively Established Coordinating Agencies Affecting Vocational Education	33
I-9	Interagency Policy Agreements Affecting Vocational Education Programs and Services	35
I-10	Informal Provisions for Direct Agency Interaction for Vocational Education	37
I-11	Changes in State Education Agencies Affecting Vocational Education	39
II-1	Definitions of Institutional Types	47
II-2	Definitions of Vocational Education Delivery Systems and Program Organization Types	48
II-3	Types of Regional Service Arrangements	49
II-4	State Vocational Education Institutions, Regional Service Arrangements, and Delivery System/Program Organization Types	50

List of Tables (Continued)

Table		Page
II-5	Total Number of Vocational Education Institutions by Type and State.	59
II-6	Educational Agency Type	60
II-7	Composition of Governing Authority.	61
II-8	Fiscal Agent Type	61
II-9	Governing Authority Type and Composition, Fiscal Agent Type, and Authority of Local Vocational Education Systems	62
IV-1	Reported Percentage of Construction Project Cost Financed with Vocational Education Act Funds.	77
IV-2	Procedures for Determining Capital Funds Allocations.	81
IV-3	Capital Funding Sources	82
IV-4	Construction and Capital Equipment Funding Provisions	88
V-1	Program Support Allocation Funding Unit	104
V-2	Program Cost Computation Procedures	105
V-3	Operating Cost Support Programs in Different States and Institutions.	106
VI-1	Distribution of Schools by Type and Region Served	126
VI-2	Distribution of Institutions and Instructional Stations in Secondary Schools vs. Population	128
VI-3	Distribution of Institutions and Instructional Stations in Postsecondary Schools vs. Population	128
VI-4	New Facility Construction and Additions from 1965 thru 1976 - Secondary.	129
VI-5	New Facility Construction and Additions from 1965 thru 1976 - Postsecondary.	129
VI-6	Distribution of Vocational Education Shops, Laboratories, and Classrooms by Institutional Type.	132

List of Tables (Continued)

Table		Page
VI-7	Average Number of Shops/Laboratories by Institutional Type and Population Service Region.	132
VI-8	Distribution of Day Program Enrollments by Institutional Type	133
VI-9	Reported Condition of Institutions By Numbers and Percents (In Parentheses) of Institutions Reporting)	134
VI-10	Accessibility of Vocational Facilities to Students with Physical Handicaps.	136
VII-1	Hours Per Class Session	139
VII-2	Estimated Average Level of Utilization (in Percent) by Institutional Type and Service Region Types	140
VII-3	Average Hours of Daily Utilization (By School, By Type, and Region Served).	141
VII-4	Use of School Facilities for Extended Day, Evening, Saturday, and Summer Sessions	142
VII-5	Sharing of Resources Between Secondary Schools.	144
VII-6	Use of Facilities in Postsecondary Institutions by Secondary Schools/Student	144
VII-7	Use of Secondary and Other Postsecondary School Facilities by Postsecondary Institutions.	144
VII-8	Use of Non-Educational Facilities By Educational Agencies	145
VII-9	Use of Educational Facilities by Non-Public School Institutions and Other Agencies	146
VII-10	Consideration and Use of Rental and/or Leased Facilities (Percent)	147
VII-11	Consideration and Use of the Conversion of an Existing Facility that Was Already the Property of the School System	149
VII-12	Consideration and Use of the Purchase and Conversion of a New Facility.	149

List of Tables (Continued)

Table		Page
VIII-1	Distribution of Levels of Program Offered by Type of Institution	152
VIII-2	Vocational Education Program Admission Criteria Applied by Different Classes of Institutions (Percent of Institutions Reporting)	154
VIII-3	Admission Schedules (By Percent of Institutions Offering Levels Identified)	155
IX-1	Priority of Factors Used in Program Selection and Facility Planning	162
IX-2	Alternative Sources of Vocational Resources Considered in Identifying Program Need (Percent of Institutions Responding) - Secondary Schools	164
IX-3	Alternative Sources of Vocational Resources Considered in Identifying Program Need (Percent of Institutions Responding) - Postsecondary Institutions	164
IX-4	Frequency of Program Demand Review and Data/Information Used in Program Review (By Percent of Institutions Responding)	166
IX-5	Criteria for Program Termination (By Percent of Institutions Responding)	166
IX-6	Factors Preventing Program Termination (By Percent of Institutions Reporting)	167
IX-7	Reasons for Non-Use of Extended Day, Evening, Saturday, and Summer Operating Schedules (By Percent of Institutions Responding) - Secondary Schools	168
IX-8	Reasons for Non-Use of Extended Day, Evening, Saturday, and Summer Operating Schedules (By Percent of Institutions Responding) - Postsecondary Schools	168
IX-9	Reasons for Non-Use of Alternative Sources of Vocational Facilities (By Percent of Institutions Responding) - Secondary Schools	169
IX-10	Reasons for Non-Use of Alternative Sources of Vocational Facilities (By Percent of Institutions Responding) - Postsecondary Schools	170

SUMMARY AND RECOMMENDATIONS

The following discussions summarize the findings of this study that have significance for Federal policy formulation and for future evaluations of vocational education programs and policy. This summary is followed by recommendations for further research.

State Governance of Vocational Education

State governance structures for vocational education may be characterized by:

- Ten (10) different types of board structures having different compositions and levels of authority over the multiple State agencies responsible for vocational education (Table I-2, page 8).

- Five (5) different classes of administrative units having varying degrees of responsibility for vocational education both within the agencies of which they are a part and in other agencies having vocational education responsibilities (Table I-3, page 9).

- Five (5) different levels of authority over institutions that provide vocational education (Table I-4, page 9).

In addition, there exists a multitude of special provisions and practices ranging from informal agreements to coordinating agencies that are established by State legislation.

All of these factors have a potentially significant impact on the extent to which the "sole State agency" for vocational education can effectively implement Federal program initiatives, and/or be accountable for compliance with all relevant Rules and Regulations and for the efficient use of vocational education resources.

Local Vocational Education Programs

Vocational education institutions and delivery systems may be classified in terms of no less than:

- Seven (7) types of institutions (Table II-1, page 47).

- Thirteen (13) different types of program administration structures (Table II-2, page 48).

- Four (4) different types of single and multi-district services (Table II-3, page 49).

In addition to these characteristics of the institutions and delivery systems, vocational education programs and institutions serving students on a "regional" basis may be characterized by as many as:

- Eight (8) educational agency types (Table II-6, page 60);

administered by governing authorities reflecting:

- Five (5) different classes of board composition -- and an equal variety of relationships among participating educational agencies and constituencies (Table II-7, page 61);

and having one of:

- Six (6) different characteristics of fiscal agent reflecting different levels of autonomy (Table II-8, page 61).

Where found, each of these characteristics reflects a different objective -- expressed or implied -- for the vocational education system or program. They also suggest differences in the extent to which State agencies can have an impact -- either by policy actions or fiscal provisions -- on the performance of the vocational education institutions and delivery systems themselves.

Vocational Education Program Financing

Vocational education programs may be financed from as many as four primary sources: local revenues; State general education revenues; State vocational education revenues; and Federal Vocational Education Act funds. Of these revenue sources the funds under the direct control of the State agency generally do not represent the major source of vocational education support; and even when they do the State agency generally has little discretion in the manner of their expenditure.

Funds for the support of vocational education are generally distributed through one of:

- Eight (8) cost allocation units (Table V-1, page 104);

applied to one of:

- Eight (8) cost computation procedures (Table V-2, page 105).

Different distribution provisions generally apply to the allocation of funds from each source -- State general education funds, State vocational education funds (where applicable), and Vocational Education Act funds. Funds from the same source may be distributed under different provisions to different institutions, or the same institution for different purposes. Furthermore,

these funds may even be differently distributed to different institutions to pay their share of the same program.

The provisions that apply to the allocation of State and Federal funds for vocational education were not explicitly investigated in this study. Nevertheless, the findings of the study may be described by four to eight characteristics of interrelationship that reflect roles that range from supplementary to complementary roles in the financing of vocational education programs.

Vocational Education Facility Resource Distribution and Utilization

The location of institutions having facilities for five or more different vocational education programs does not reflect the distribution of the population. This disparity is reflected in the data presented in Tables I and II on the following page. Data presented in these tables indicate that the institution/population and station/population ratios are significantly higher for medium cities, small towns and rural communities than for the central cities and schools of large urban areas. This suggests that either the needs of cities and suburbs of major urban areas are not being met; the needs of medium cities, small towns and rural areas are overmet; or both.

Data compiled on facility utilization has proven to be inconclusive. Data obtained in this study has been analyzed in a variety of ways, based on several sets of "rules" relating to program operating patterns. However, none of the "rules" tested on the available data could be broadly verified by other data sources. The only conclusion which can be drawn from these findings is that there is great diversity in the operating characteristics of different institutions in different States. Moreover, an analysis of available data based on State and institution specific operating practices will be required in order to adequately assess the utilization of vocational education facilities.

The data and information compiled in the conduct of this study suggest the following three general conclusions:

- Differences that exist in the organization, governance, and financing of vocational education systems of the 56 States and Territories are likely to have a significant impact on the manner in which Federal policies are implemented in these different States and Territories and the effect of those policies on achieving the objectives established by the Federal government.

- Provisions of Federal legislation relating to the manner in which funds are to be distributed (e.g., formula distribution requirements) do not inherently assure the most efficient use of such resources.

- Many assumptions relating to the functioning of the vocational education system -- specifically those

Table I

Distribution of Institutions and Instructional Stations in Secondary Schools vs. Population

Population Region Type	Institutions		Stations[1]	Population
	Number	Percent	Percent	Percent
A. Central City, Metropolitan Population over 500,000	103	9.3	13.3	22.8
B. Suburb, Metropolitan Population over 500,000	110	10.0	10.5	38.0
C. Central City, Metropolitan Population 100-500,000	102	9.3	17.1	8.9
D. Suburb, Metropolitan Population 100-500,000	33	3.1	2.9	3.6
E. City or Town Population 25-100,000	197	17.8	15.5	3.1
F. Town or Region Population 0-25,000	115	10.5	6.7	23.6
G. Service Area not Elsewhere Classified	440	40.0	34.0	NA
Total[2]	1,100	100.0	100.0	100.0

[1] Instructional stations.

[2] Institutional totals (6,660) do not equal total survey responses (6,693) because some institutions did not respond to the classifying question used in the generation of this table.

Table II

Distribution of Institutions and Instructional Stations in Postsecondary Schools vs. Population

Population Region Type	Institutions		Stations[1]	Population
	Number	Percent	Percent	Percent
A. Central City, Metropolitan Population over 500,000	453	8.1	10.6	22.8
B. Suburb, Metropolitan Population over 500,000	597	10.7	13.5	38.0
C. Central City, Metropolitan Population 100-500,000	368	6.6	8.2	8.9
D. Suburb, Metropolitan Population 100-500,000	277	5.0	6.1	3.6
E. City or Town Population 25-100,000	958	17.3	21.4	3.1
F. Town or Region Population 0-25,000	2,402	43.2	34.5	23.6
G. Service Area not Elsewhere Classified	505	9.1	5.7	NA
Total[2]	5,560	100.0	100.0	100.0

[1] Instructional stations.

[2] Institutional totals (6,660) do not equal total survey responses (6,693) because some institutions did not respond to the classifying question used in the generation of this table.

relating to the efficient utilization of facility resources and to the adequacy of existing resources to meet student demands -- are not generally supported by study findings.

Available data is insufficient to provide a basis for determining the specific impact that these tentative conclusions have on the policy making and evaluation requirements of Federal agencies. However, an examination of these tentative conclusions and summary observations undertaken in the light of past and present policy studies suggests several issues whose further study is warranted. These suggestions are enumerated below.

Recommendations for Further Studies

The following sections identify topics which, based on the findings of this project, warrant further study.

State Agency Policy and Governance

Studies of the process by which policies and priorities are established at the State level, and the significance of these practices on the implementation of the provisions of Federal legislation, should include examinations of the following:

- The process of both formal and informal agency interaction and the "impact" of such interactions on policy decision-making and the implementation of policy.
- The degree to which State policy is a function of the State requirements or is a reflection of limitations set by statute and other political factors external to the State agency.
- The role and impact of legislatively mandated planning committees and review groups who participate in the development of the State Plan for Vocational Education.
- The impact of State policy -- both planning and administrative practices -- on the operation of institutions.
- The basis for coordination between Federal and State statutes for vocational education and an investigation of the question, "Do Federal statutes limit State statutory authorization but leave unlimited the capacity for State appropriations?"

These issues clearly have major significance for vocational education. Because of the extreme differences in State governance structures for vocational education which were indicated in previous discussions, these issues can be meaningfully addressed only in the context of a study that is national in scope and that includes an assessment of each of the characteristics of agency interaction identified in the preceding discussions. Such a study should also include an effort to expand upon previously identified provisions through an identification and assessment of the impact of characteristics not identified by the current study.

Local Agency Governance Structures and Fiscal Agencies

The results of this study suggest that a substantial number of characteristics about the governance and fiscal agent status of local vocational education agencies and institutions exist that may have an impact on the implementation of State and Federal policies and programs. These characteristics clearly do have significant implications for any studies of vocational education costs and any studies of the flow of vocational education funds. Therefore, a need exists for studies to identify:

- The impact of alternative local vocational education agency and institution governance structures on the operating characteristics of institutions (e.g., utilization, operating hours, students served, etc.) and on the responsiveness of agencies and institutions to State and Federal program and policy initiatives.

- The fiscal agency and fiscal support structure for all institutions providing vocational education.

These study topics apply principally to regional vocational education programs that are generally under the most direct control of relevant State agencies.

The first of these suggested studies, which would be undertaken, ideally in combination with the suggested studies of State agency policy formulation and governance, is essential to any attempt to assess the factors affecting State compliance with relevant Federal legislation. Furthermore, the first study constitutes a requirement of any effort to identify the factors affecting compliance and the points at which "corrective action" should be applied most meaningfully.

The second of these studies is essential because: it provides the critical supplementary data that is required to understand data from other studies relating to the distribution of vocational education funds; it is a critical link between the institutions reporting receipt and expenditure of State and Federal funds and the institution in which services are provided; and it represents critical data to be used in any sample study of vocational education costs.

Financing Vocational Education

Since the effective implementation of policy is ultimately determined by provisions of financing that are aimed at promoting the implementation of policy, the effectiveness of alternative funding policies and procedures must be understood. However, State statutes and policies have a significant impact on the kinds of funding policies and provisions that can be implemented and on the effect of applying new policies to one funding source (especially Federal) when others remain unchanged. Therefore, it is necessary to conduct studies of:

- The impact and effectiveness of alternative vocational education funding programs on the operating characteristics and practices of local vocational education agencies and institutions.

- The availability of alternative funding policies in individual States.

Because of the diverse vocational education funding policies in different States and the potential significance of such a study for the formulation of both State and Federal funding, such a study should involve an examination of practices, and their impact, in all States and Territories.

Facility Distribution and Utilization

The results of this study leave unanswered many of the questions about the adequacy of coverage of present vocational education institutions and programs and the effectiveness with which existing facility resources are being utilized. These limitations, however, are not so much limitations of data as limitations on resources required to address these questions. Therefore, further examination of these data should be undertaken in an effort to identify factors that affect the utilization of available facilities. An examination of the extent to which additional facilities may be required to meet the demands for vocational education should also be undertaken.

BACKGROUND, PURPOSE, AND OBJECTIVES

Background

In December 1974, the United States General Accounting Office published the results of its study of the Nation's vocational education system in the report entitled, What is the Role of Federal Assistance for Vocational Education? This report -- which was based on a review of State and local vocational education agencies in seven States -- noted numerous "weaknesses" in the planning, resource allocation, and program operating characteristics of the vocational education systems and administrative agencies studied.

The conclusions presented by the General Accounting Office were generally accepted as valid inferences about practices that could be improved through corrective action at the Federal, State, and local levels. However, the limited sample on which these conclusions and subsequent recommendations were based left serious doubt as to the magnitude of the problems noted.

Stimulated by the report of the General Accounting Office and by the fact that no national study of the organizational characteristics and operating practices of the vocational education system of the United States had ever been undertaken, the Bureau of Occupational and Adult Education (BOAE) of the U.S. Office of Education identified the need for a broad-based study. This study would provide additional information about both (a) the issues highlighted in the GAO. report, and (b) the vocational education systems of the individual States and the Nation as a whole.

In considering the requirements for such a study, BOAE also noted that more than $750 million dollars in Vocational Education Act funds, and many billions of dollars of State and local funds, had been spent on the construction of facilities and acquisition of equipment for vocational education. However, little is known about how these funds had been spent, the types of institutions in which they had been spent, or the State policies that have governed their expenditure.

As a result, the Deputy Commissioner of the Bureau of Occupational and Adult Education requested the Office of Planning, Budgeting and Evaluation to conduct an assessment of the availability and utilization of vocational education facility resources and to examine the factors affecting the planning and operation of vocational education programs. In the study requested by the Deputy Commissioner, specific emphasis was to be placed on an assessment of the impact of funds provided by the Federal government on the expansion of vocational facilities.

Purpose of Study

The "National Study of Vocational Education Systems and Facilities" was initially commissioned by OPBE as a study of the utilization of vocational education facilities and the factors affecting their planning and effective utilization. This study was intended to identify the legislative provisions and planning practices that could be implemented at the Federal, State, and local levels to improve the utilization of vocational education resources.

Quoting from the Deputy Commissioner's request, the specific objective of this study was to provide information that would:

> ". . . .Assist the Bureau of Occupational and Adult Education to determine if Federal laws and regulations concerning the use of Federal vocational education funds for construction and/or expansion of facilities should be revised, what alternatives should be considered, and what alternative strategies should be suggested to State and local education agencies to facilitate the optimal use of local community training resources."[1]

This general study objective was "operationalized" by the following specific requirements:

- To identify, describe, and analyze how States establish priorities and allocate funds for use of Part B monies along with State funds for construction and equipment purposes.
- To examine how States develop criteria and procedures for providing technical assistance to LEA's for construction/expansion of vocational facilities.
- To examine the extent to which existing vocational training facilities are used to capacity.
- To determine the effect of the geographic area and associated admissions criteria on the type and extent of the facility constructed.
- To identify and analyze needs-assessment and planning operations that appear to be successful and to determine factors that inhibit planning and capacity utilization of existing facilities.

---

[1] Request for Proposal "An Assessment of Area Vocational Facilities Constructed Under the Vocational Education Act of 1968 as Amended," USOE/OPBE.

Discussion of Study Requirements

Webster's New Collegiate Dictionary defines a "system" as a "regularly interacting or interdependent group of items forming a unified whole."

If Webster's definition of a "system" is applied to vocational education, then the nation's vocational education "system" may not be characterized solely in terms of the facilities in which vocational education is provided; and the formulation of Federal policies that will promote the efficient utilization of facilities cannot be based solely on knowledge of the characteristics of these institutions. Rather, such policies must be based on a consideration of the impact that the other "interacting and interdependent" components of the system have on the operation of the system as a whole.

The United States does not have a vocational education system. The vocational education "system" of the United States is the sum total of vocational education systems of the 56 independent States and Territories. Each of these systems is characterized by a relatively unique mix of legislative provisions, State and local agency governance structures, funding policies, and institutional types which constitute the "interacting and interdependent" components of each State and Territorial vocational education system.

Federal legislation and policy is the major "interacting and interdependent" component of the nation's vocational education program that is common to all State and Territory vocational education systems. Because Federal legislation and policy is only one of the factors influencing the individual State and Territory vocational education systems, the impact of Federal legislation on the delivery of vocational education services within each State and Territory will inevitably be influenced by the other components of each vocational education system.

It is unrealistic to expect that permissive Federal legislation could have a uniform effect on all States unless it was accompanied by a definitive and clearly articulated Federal policy statement defining the functional objectives for the development of State vocational education systems -- at least with respect to their use of Federal funds. Even under such circumstances, and because great differences exist in their present systems, different States and Territories would inevitably, by virtue of the fact that great differences exist in their present systems, implement widely diverse strategies to achieve these objectives. Thus, any effort to evaluate progress toward a defined goal would require a knowledge of the conditions which defined the "starting point" for each of the States and Territories.

On the other hand, if Federal policy were to be implemented through prescriptive legislation, the development of such policies and legislation would require a detailed knowledge of the existing vocational education systems of the States and Territories as they now exist so as to insure that such legislation and policy be realistic and attainable within the characteristics of -- and constraints imposed by -- the existing systems.

Whatever approach is taken to the formulation and implementation of Federal policy, it is clear that a necessary prerequisite to the formulation of such policy requires an understanding of the existing State and Territorial vocational education systems, an understanding of how and why these systems have developed, and how they are likely to change in the future.

When this study was initiated, it was expected that it would be possible to identify specific organizational characteristics, fiscal policies, and/or planning practices that could be correlated with the efficient utilization of vocational education facilities and resources. However, during the detailed analysis of the study objectives which was undertaken following the contract award, it was determined that the topics identified in the RFP could not be investigated meaningfully as independent variables. Rather, these topics were determined to be of significance only in the context of the unique characteristics of the vocational education delivery systems that exist in each State and Territory.

A preliminary investigation of the availability of data regarding the organization and operating characteristics of the vocational education systems of the individual States revealed a serious gap in the available information about the Nation's vocational education system. Therefore, the objectives of this study were adjusted to emphasize the acquisition of descriptive information about the organization, operation, and financing of vocational education institutions and delivery systems.

This revision of study objectives led to an investigation of many aspects of the vocational education systems of the States and Territories which, while not directly related to facility and resource utilization, will inevitably affect the implementation of policies and legislation aimed at improving the effective utilization of facilities and other resources.

As this study proceeded, it became increasingly clear that there was significantly more variance to the vocational education systems of the individual States than had been previously anticipated and that much of the information secured in this study would be of great significance to future studies of the vocational education system. It also became clear that it would be significantly beyond the scope of this study to conduct a comprehensive analysis of all the data collected. Therefore, it was decided that the "analytical" component of this study would be limited to an interpretive analysis of data relating to facility accessibility and utilization. The treatment of all other topics would be limited to a descriptive documentation of practices that have an impact on Federal expenditures for vocational education.

Study Objectives

As finally established through discussions with Office of Education personnel, the objectives of this study call for the acquisition of the following:

- Information relating to the organization and governance of State and local vocational education agencies and delivery systems for vocational education.

- Information relating to the financing of vocational education and the legislation, policies, and procedures under which States allocate both State and Federal funds for vocational education facilities and equipment and program operation.

- Information relating to the status and condition of the Nation's vocational education delivery system and institutions with emphasis on the availability and utilization of facility resources.

- Information relating to the planning and program operating characteristics of local education agencies that have an impact on the utilization of vocational education facilities.

Specific data and information that were to be secured and reported in this study are identified in the following topics.

Organization and Governance of Vocational Education

The effectiveness of Federal legislation in achieving its intended objectives is significantly affected by the characteristics of the State and local agencies responsible for the administration of Federal funds and programs. Because the impact of Federal legislation is tempered by State and local conditions, the impact of State and local agency policies and practices on the effective use of Federal funds cannot be successfully evaluated until their major characteristics are known. The preliminary analysis of the requirements of this study revealed that little information existed about the characteristics of the agencies and delivery systems associated with the Nation's vocational education system. Therefore, the objectives established for this study included the compilation of data and information regarding the principal organizational characteristics, policies, and practices of the agencies and delivery systems through which vocational education is provided.

At the State level, this objective required the identification of the agencies having responsibilities for vocational education and their place in the State educational system. Also, this objective required the identification of the formal and informal relationship that exists between multiple agencies relative to the planning and coordination of vocational education program development and the control and expenditure of Vocational Education Act funds. Information was to be sought about State legislation and policies relating to the financing of vocational education facilities construction and equipment acquisition and the financing of the operating costs of vocational education.

At the local level, this study was intended to provide documentation of the organization and governance characteristics of vocational education. This objective was to be met through the compilation of information relating to the type of agencies and administrative authorities responsible for vocational education programs and operating characteristics of vocational education programs, especially shared-time programs and inter-institutional arrangements that affect the use of vocational education facilities.

Financing Vocational Education

The effectiveness of Federal and State funds appropriated for vocational education is determined largely by legislation and policy established at the State level. An examination of historical data regarding vocational education expenditures suggested that significant changes have occurred in the legislation and/or policies relating to the use of both State and Federal funds for vocational education. Because State legislation and policy significantly affect the expenditure of Federal vocational education funds, any evaluation of the impact of effectiveness of Federal funds must recognize and take account of these factors. Since little was known about the specific practices, policies, and procedures governing the expenditure of vocational education funds, it became an objective of this study to document the general provisions under which State and Federal Vocational Education Act Part B Basic Grant funds are expended for facilities construction, equipment acquisition, and basic instructional program support.

Specifically excluded from this study was any attempt to provide detailed information about the provisions for funding the costs identified above; and no attempt was made to document practices, policies, and procedures for the expenditure of funds from other Parts of the Act.

Also, as discussed previously, it was determined that a detailed analysis of the impact of alternative funding provisions is beyond the scope of this study. The presentation and discussion of data and information relating to programs on facility funding were, therefore, to be limited to descriptions of the alternative funding procedures.

Status and Condition of the Vocational Education System

Until this study was initiated, virtually no information existed about the status and condition of the nation's vocational education system -- its capacity; the extent of its services; its accessibility and the extent of its coverage; and the condition and adequacy of its facilities, etc.

While this study initially was to have been conducted on the basis of a sample of local education agencies, the preliminary analysis of information that existed before this study revealed that, at that time this study was initiated, there did not exist a reliable data base which could be used as a basis for drawing a study sample. This void highlighted the absence of other vital information about the institutions providing vocational education and resulted in the development of a comprehensive description of the institutions which comprised the primary delivery systems of the nation's vocational

education system. This documentation was to include an analysis of factors ranging from facilities information (such as age, condition, capacity, etc.) to information about the populations served, both geographic types (urban, suburban, rural, etc.) and students (secondary, postsecondary, and adult). Also included was information about the extent to which available facility resources are used to their capacity, either by the public schools themselves or other agencies having responsibilities for manpower and human resource development.

Planning

The GAO report, which was the initial stimulus for this study, was particularly critical of the quality of program planning activities undertaken by State and local education agencies. This study, therefore, sought to provide information about the process of program planning.

At the State level, this requirement called for the acquisition of information about program planning and approval requirements imposed by State Agencies and the types of technical assistance provided by State Agencies. Information was thus sought on both the specific data required by State Agencies and the activities undertaken in the process of evaluating local planning activities and funding applications. This activity was limited to an analysis of data requirements and technical assistance programs relating to vocational education facilities.

At the local level, this study objective was to be addressed through the collection and analysis of information about the activities undertaken by local education agencies in the planning of new facilities for vocational education. This objective included a documentation of: data used in planning, the priorities assigned to different planning decision factors, and the participation of diverse segments of the community in the planning process.

In addition, this study was intended to determine the types of ongoing planning and program review activities that are undertaken by local education agencies to insure the continuing efficient use of available vocational education facilities.

Organization of Report

The report on this study is contained in three volumes:

- Volume I presents the major data and findings of this study.
- Volume II presents summary reports on the organization and financing of vocational education in each State and Territory.
- Volume III presents a detailed discussion of the study methodology.

Volume I (this volume) is presented in three parts:

PART I: An identification of the organizational, legislative, and funding characteristics of the vocational education systems of the 56 States and Territories.

PART II: A discussion of the resources, services, and operating characteristics of institutions in which vocational education is provided.

PART III: A discussion of the planning practices of State and local agencies for vocational education.

Data Sources

The data and information contained in this report were compiled through the following three major activities:[2]

- A comprehensive review of the literature relating to vocational education programs, including research studies, planning documents, State Plans, Annual Reports, and legislation.

- In-depth interviews with the State Directors of Vocational Education and/or their staffs and the executive officers for other public education systems providing vocational education in all 56 States and Territories. (No attempt was made to contact agencies external to the formal State education governance systems, e.g., 1202 Commissions, State Advisory Councils for Vocational Education, etc.)

- A mailed survey of all secondary and free-standing two-year postsecondary institutions administered by a public education agency and having facilities for five or more different vocational education programs.

Data contained in this report are based on conditions reported to exist during the summer and fall of 1977. (Since many State vocational education systems have changed their operating policies and provisions since this time -- largely as a result of the provisions of the Education Amendments of 1976 -- some of the data contained in this report may already be out of date.)

---

[2]See Volume III for a detailed discussion of the study methodology and procedures.

PART I

ORGANIZATION, GOVERNANCE, AND FINANCING OF VOCATIONAL EDUCATION SYSTEMS

The chapters in Part I are intended to describe the organization, governance, and financing of the vocational education systems of the 56 States and Territories. To assist in this description, the characteristics of the vocational education systems of the States and Territories have been classified so as to (a) be useful in understanding these systems as they exist today; and (b) provide a "standard" basis on which the characteristics of State and Territorial vocational education systems may be classified for future studies. In the absence of any other general classifying basis, the classifications used in the following chapters have been developed solely on the basis of data assembled in the conduct of this study.

Part I of this report is organized as follows:

Chapter I describes the present and historical organization of State vocational education administration structures and identifies the various types of formal and informal relationships that exist among agencies at the State level that have an impact on the formulation and implementation of policies and programs within each State and Territory.

Chapter II summarizes the vocational education system of the nation in terms of: the types of institutions providing vocational education; the operating characteristics of these institutions which affect the delivery of vocational education on a regional basis; and the patterns of governance and the fiscal status of vocational education programs administered by different types of local education agencies.

Chapter III presents a general discussion of factors that have historically affected the use of State and Federal funds in the expansion and operation of vocational education programs and that account, in part, for the many significant differences that exist in the funding policies and practices of the States and Territories.

Chapter IV describes the practices of States and Territories in the financing of facilities construction and equipment acquisition in different types of vocational education institutions.

Chapter V describes the practices of States and Territories for the financing of vocational education operating costs in different types of vocational education institutions.

Because an evaluation of the impact of the alternative characteristics described in these sections is beyond the scope of this study, no interpretation of the information contained in these chapters is included. Rather, this information is intended to be used for reference purposes, and the data have been presented in tabular form wherever possible.

Information presented in these chapters represents generalized summary classifications of State and local education policies and practices. More detailed specific information about each of these systems is contained in the descriptions of the vocational education systems of each State contained in Volume II of this report.

CHAPTER I

STATE GOVERNANCE OF VOCATIONAL EDUCATION

Federal legislation calls for the designation of a single "State Board" to receive and to be accountable for the expenditure of Vocational Education Act funds. This provision establishes a single agency within each State as the agency responsible for each State's vocational education system. Vocational education policy is, however, rarely established by a single agency, and the total vocational education system of a State is generally not under the authority of a single administrative agency or policy forming body.

Federal legislation also mandates State "matching" of Federal funds for vocational education and "maintenance of effort" in State (and local) funding. These provisions enable the Federal government, in effect, to control a significant portion of the vocational education program of a State while providing only approximately 10 percent of the fiscal resources for vocational education. Clearly, there is the potential for complications to arise in the application of these provisions to multiple agencies by a State Board which does not have authority over all agencies; yet it is through multiple agencies, not a single board or agency, that vocational education policy is implemented in most States.

Little homogeneity exists in the structure of the governing authorities and administrative agencies responsible for vocational education in the 56 States and Territories. Therefore, any attempt to study the impact of State governance structures on the formulation of vocational education policy and the administration of State vocational education systems must be designed to accommodate at least the following five facts:

- A great diversity exists among the States regarding the structure and authority of the Board which is designated to serve as the State Board for Vocational Education.

- A great diversity exists in both the characteristics of agencies responsible for the implementation of State Board policy and in the location of these agencies within each State's educational governance system.

- A great diversity of provisions, both formal and informal, exists for the coordination of the activities of different agencies having administrative responsibilities for vocational education institutions and programs.

- A great diversity exists in the relationship which exists between the State agencies responsible for the governance of vocational education and the institutions in which vocational education is provided.

- A great diversity exists in the level of control which individual Boards and agencies actually have over the distribution of funds -- especially those funds directly expended by other agencies.

There is a generally held assumption that little coordination exists among State agencies having responsibility for vocational education. However, the findings of this study suggest that the opposite may be true.

The forms in which coordination between State agencies occurs are so diverse that it is difficult to estimate what impact the characteristics of the State governance systems have on the effectiveness of each State's vocational education system. It may be assumed, however, that these characteristics have some impact on the degree to which Federal policy, as represented by Federal legislation and Rules and Regulations, affects the structure of each State's vocational education system and the degree to which the performance of these systems meets the intent of Federal legislation.

The purpose of the following discussions is to provide planners and policy-makers with a more complete understanding of the characteristics of State governance structures and the relationships that exist between agencies whose actions have an impact on the implementation of Federal policy.

Further, since a knowledge of the conditions under which existing vocational education systems developed is essential to an understanding of their current characteristics, this chapter also includes an identification of the major changes that have occurred in State vocational education governance systems.

The following discussions are intended to:

- Describe the organization of the vocational education governance system of each State, including an identification of provisions which exist for the "formal" and "informal" coordination of activities among agencies and an identification of the relationships that exist between State agencies and the institutions operating vocational education programs.

- Identify the major changes that have occurred in the organization of vocational education governance structures since the enactment of the Vocational Education Act of 1963.

Because of the great diversity of characteristics that affect the governance of vocational education, no attempt has been made to codify all of these characteristics. However, for variables which appear to have a significant impact on the characteristics of State vocational education systems, a

codifying/classifying[1] system has been developed to simplify the following presentation and to provide a basis for the design of future vocational education studies.

Organization of State Vocational Education System Governance Structures

The following topics discuss: the "formal" and "informal" characteristics of State vocational education governance structures and administrative authorities; and the provisions which exist for inter- and intra-agency coordination of vocational education at the State level.

Formal Provisions for Policy Formulation and the Coordination of Vocational Education

The information secured in this study suggests that agency interaction may generally be described by five characteristics of State vocational education governance systems:

- The primary organization and administrative structures.
- The composition of governing boards.
- The structured provisions which exist for direct agency interaction.
- The existence of legislatively established coordinating authorities.
- The existence of, and provisions of, role and mission statements, etc.

Table I-1 summarizes the provisions that exist for program coordination in each State. Based on the summary presented in Table I-1, three significant observations can be made:

- A majority of States have made some provision for agency interaction to promote the coordinated development of vocational education in institutions operating under the authority of multiple agencies.

[1]The classification schema presented here have been developed on the basis of this study alone. While they correspond in varying degrees with classification schemes presented elsewhere in the literature on vocational education, they should not be confused with, or used interchangeably with, other classifying terminology.

Table I-1

Summary of Provisions for Agency Interaction

State	Agency Interaction Is Achieved Through: Board Membership Provisions[1]	Structured Provisions for Formal Agency Interaction[2]	Legislatively Created Coordinating Authorities[3]	Role and/or Mission Statement[4]	Informal Agency Interaction[5]
Alabama	S				
Alaska	S				
Arizona	X				X
Arkansas			X		
California		X			
Colorado	S	X			
Connecticut	X	X		X	
Delaware		X	X		X
District of Columbia					
Florida	S				
Georgia				X	
Hawaii	X	X			
Idaho	S				
Illinois	X	X	X		X
Indiana	X				
Iowa	S				
Kansas	S				
Kentucky					
Louisiana					
Maine	S				
Maryland					
Massachusetts	X			X	
Michigan	S				
Minnesota			X		
Mississippi	S				
Missouri					
Montana	S				
Nebraska			X		
Nevada					
New Hampshire	S		X		
New Jersey					X
New Mexico	S				
New York	S				
North Carolina	S	X		X	
North Dakota	X	X	X		
Ohio				X	
Oklahoma		X		X	
Oregon	S		X		
Pennsylvania	S		X		
Rhode Island	S				
South Carolina	X				X
South Dakota	X				
Tennessee		X			
Texas				X	
Utah	S	X			
Vermont					
Virginia				X	
Washington	X				
West Virginia				X	
Wisconsin	X	X		X	
Wyoming	X				
American Samoa	S				
Guam	S				
Puerto Rico	X	X			
Trust Territory	S				
Virgin Islands	S				

[1]For specific provisions see Table I-6.

[2]For specific provisions see Table I-7.

[3]For specific provisions see Table I-8.

[4]For specific provisions see Table I-9.

[5]For specific provisions see Table I-10.

X: Provision exists; see following tables for specific provisions.

S: Single State Board has responsibility over all institutions offering vocational education.

- The provisions which have been made for agency interaction in the different States have little in common.

- The provisions which exist for interagency coordination appear to be independent of State characteristics such as levels of industrialization, urbanization, etc. and, therefore, may be assumed to be primarily a function of political factors.

The objectives of this study were limited to an identification of agency interactions and coordination provisions, and no information was sought relating to the impact or outcomes of these provisions. The following topics are, therefore, intended only to identify characteristics of agency interaction as they now exist.

Primary Organization Structures: Three variables relating to State vocational education system governance structures appear to have the greatest potential for having an impact on policy formulation, program implementation, and the development of the State's vocational education systems. These are:

- The board designated to serve as the State Board for Vocational Education.

- The location and responsibilities of State agencies having responsibility for the implementation of State Board policy for vocational education.

- The level of direct control which State agencies responsible for the implementation of State Board policy can exercise over the institutions providing vocational education.

Tables I-2 (page 11), I-3 (page 12), and I-4 (page 12) present classifying definitions of "State Board" types, State Agency responsibilities for vocational education, and State Agency control over local institutions. The classification models presented in these tables are intended to identify and to differentiate between the structural differences in various systems and are not intended to reflect the operational differences in these systems.

Table I-5 (page 13) describes the vocational education system of each State in terms of the classifications presented in Tables I-2, I-3, and I-4.

Composition of Governing Boards: In addition to the relationships between State agencies which are shown on organization charts (and summarized in Table I-5) the implementation of State Board policy may be affected by the composition of the State Board for Vocational Education and the governing Boards (where they differ from the State Board) of other agencies for vocational education programs. As shown in Table I-5, in 31 States, vocational education is provided in secondary or postsecondary institutions which are under an agency and Board other than the State Board of Vocational Education. However, eight (8) of these States have made provision for the membership of agency administrators and/or Board members from one agency on the policymaking Board of the other agency.

Table I-6 (page 25) summarizes the interagency board membership provisions of the 56 States and Territories.

As reported in Table I-6, the most common means of providing agency interaction through Board membership is based on ex-officio Board appointments. Ex-officio membership on the State Board is generally limited to the Chief State School Officer, executive officers of other agencies, or members of the Boards of other agencies responsible for the administration of programs in vocational education. Except in those States where the State Board of Vocational-Technical Education exists as an independent policy making unit, the State Director of vocational education is never an ex-officio member of a State Board. Thus, because executive officers generally have responsibilities for many services other than vocational education, agency interactions occurring at the executive and policy making level may not adequately meet the requirements for the coordination of vocational education policy and program development plans.

Structured Provisions for Direct Agency Interaction: Structured provisions for direct interaction between State agencies reported in Table I-7 (page 29) have been identified in 14 States. These provisions are generally reflected in interactions between the operating staff of the agencies -- as opposed to the administrative or policy level interactions occurring at the Board level.

From discussions with agency personnel, it appears that direct agency interaction at the staff level -- as opposed to the Board level -- is the more significant means of promoting coordination because of the greater focus on activities than on administrative formalities.

Legislatively Established Coordinating Agencies: Formal program coordination between agencies is also represented by agencies and commissions that exist apart from the Boards and agencies responsible for educational policy, but which have responsibility for the coordination of activities undertaken by various agencies. Table I-8 (page 33) describes the legislatively established coordinating agencies and commissions identified in this study.

Legislatively established coordinating agencies generally have no direct authority over the agencies whose programs and policies they are charged

with reviewing. However, the status of such agencies as legislatively established authorities suggests the existence of significant authority beyond that defined directly by their function and role description.

Since the functions and responsibilities of these agencies may be a significant factor in the determination of the omnibus State "policies" for vocational education, the role of these agencies in the formulation of policy and the governance of vocational education clearly requires further study.

Role and Mission Statements: Role and mission statements, etc., differ from the three types of provisions identified in the preceding topics in that they are static provisions which establish the basis for the operating activities of individual agencies. Such provisions may be based on legislation, joint agreements, or joint policy statements which define the roles and responsibilities of individual agencies and institutions.

Summarized in Table I-9 (page 35), formal role and mission statements and joint policy agreements have been developed by relatively few States.

From available evidence, it is not clear whether the policies established by these agreements and statutes were intended to provide a basis for coordination in vocational education program planning and development, or were simply intended to delineate areas of responsibility and to reduce agency conflict.

Informal Provisions for the Coordination of Vocational Education

In addition to the formal provisions for agency interaction that exist in most States, a variety of informal provisions exist which are designed to promote the coordination of agency policy and program development and to establish both complementary and supplementary roles for institutions providing vocational education at different levels.

For the purposes of this study, "informal" provisions are distinguished from "formal" provisions for interagency coordination by the following three factors:

- Informal interaction among agencies is characterized by interactions that occur independent of the organization characteristics and the reporting and administrative structures of the agency.

- As opposed to interactions characterized by formal procedures, informal interaction between agencies is characterized by ad hoc interaction between agencies, meeting agendas and approval requirements, etc.

- Informal interaction, because it occurs as a result of joint agency initiative, is often more action oriented than most formal provisions for "coordination."

Informal program planning and coordination practices identified in this study are listed in Table I-10 (page 37). (It should be noted, however, that "casual" interaction between agencies to deal with specific problems or issues of mutual interest have not been specifically identified in this table. Such provisions, however, were reported by several respondents.)

As shown in this table, few States have implemented informal practices of agency interaction. This fact may suggest that either (a) there is a general resistance to interaction unless formalized by structure; or (b) alternative means of promoting interaction noted previously adequately respond to these needs. Further study is required to test these hypotheses.

Changes in Organizational Structures

Since the primary organizational structures of individual States have changed substantially in recent years, it is important for researchers to know the history of the primary organizational structures of each State. Changes in the organization structures, identified in the conduct of this survey, are reported in Table I-11 (page 39).

Table I-2

State Board Types

Type	Definition
Type I	The State Board for Vocational Education is an independently constituted Board responsible for vocational education policy but not having a direct authority over the State agencies responsible for the implementation of policy and the supervision of institutions providing vocational education.
Type II*	The State Board for Vocational Education is an independently constituted Board responsible for vocational education policy and having direct authority over a State agency having responsibility for the implementation of policy and the supervision of institutions providing vocational education at the secondary and/or postsecondary levels.
Type III*	The State Board for Vocational Education is an independently constituted Board having responsibility for vocational education policy and serving as the administrative agency responsible for both the implementation of policy and the supervision of institutions providing vocational education at the secondary and/or postsecondary levels.
Type IV*	The State Board for Vocational Education is constituted from the membership of another Board which has direct authority over one or more of the State agencies having responsibility for the implementation of policy and the supervision of institutions providing vocational education.

*State Boards of Types II, III, and IV may be further classified by subtypes depending on the agencies and/or institutions over which they have direct authority. The three primary subtypes of State Boards are:

Subtype (A) State Board is over State Agency having responsibility for institutions operating at the secondary level but does not have direct authority over institutions at the postsecondary level.

Subtype (B) State Board is over State Agency having responsibility for institutions operating at the postsecondary level but does not have direct authority over institutions operating at the secondary level.

Subtype (C) State Board is over State Agency having authority over all institutions which constitute the primary delivery system for vocational education at the secondary and postsecondary levels.

Table I-3

State Agency Responsibility for Vocational Education

Model	Definition
Model I	State Agency has administrative responsibility only; the direct supervision of institutions providing vocational education is the responsibility of another agency within the same department or division of the State educational system.
Model II	State Agency has direct responsibility over institutions providing vocational education at one (secondary or postsecondary) level but has no direct authority over institutions operating vocational education at the other level.
Model III	State Agency has been delegated administrative responsibility over institutions providing vocational education at one level (secondary or postsecondary).
Model IV	State Agency has direct responsibility over institutions providing vocational education at both the secondary and postsecondary levels.
Model V	State Agency has direct responsibility over institutions providing vocational education at one level (secondary or postsecondary) and direct authority for program approval and evaluation of institutions operating at the other level.

Table I-4

State Agency Authority Over Local (Vocational) Institutions

Class	Definition
Class I	Institutions offering vocational education are administered directly by the State education agency and are fully State funded.
Class II	Institutions offering vocational education are administered by a local agency under the direct authority of the State education agency and are fully State funded.
Class III	Institutions offering vocational education are administered by a local authority reporting to the State Agency and are funded with State and local funds.
Class IV	Institutions administered under policies established by a State Agency other than the vocational education agency, e.g., university system.
Class V	Institutions administered "independently" by a local education agency under policies established by the State education agency indicated.

Table I-5

State Vocational Education
Governance Structures

State	State Board	Type	Administrative Agencies			Agency Authority	
			Agency	Board Reported To	Responsibility	Institutions	Authority
Alabama	State Board for Vocational Education (State Board of Education)	Type VI(c)	Division of Vocational Education/State Department of Education	State Board of Education	Model II	Comprehensive High Schools	Class V
						Area Vocational Centers	Class V
			Division of Postsecondary and Continuing Education/ State Department of Education	State Board of Education	Model III	Technical Colleges and Institutes	Class II
						Junior and Community Colleges	Class II
Alaska	State Board for Vocational Education (State Board of Education)	Type IV(a)	Division of Career and Vocational Education/ State Department of Education	State Board of Education	Model II	Comprehensive High Schools	Class V
						Career Centers	Class V
			Community College System	Board of Regents of Higher Education	Model III	Community Colleges	Class I
Arizona	State Board for Vocational Education (State Board of Education)	Type IV(a)	Division of Career and Vocational Education/ State Department of Education	State Board of Education	Model II	Comprehensive High Schools	Class V
			State Board of Directors of Community Colleges	State Board of Directors of Community Colleges	Model III	Community Colleges	Class III
Arkansas	State Board for Vocational Education (State Board of Education)	Type IV(c)	Division of Vocational Education/State Department of Education	State Board of Education	Model IV	Comprehensive High Schools	Class V
						Area High School Centers	Class V
						Area Vocational Schools	Class I
			State Community/Junior College Board	State Community/Junior College Board	Model III	Community Colleges	Class III
California	State Board of Vocational-Technical Education (State Board of Education	Type IV(a)	Vocational Education Unit/State Department of Education	State Board of Education	Model I	Comprehensive High Schools	Class V
						Regional Occupational Centers	Class V
			Office of the Chancellor of the Community College System	Board of Governors of the Community College System	Model III	Community Colleges	Class I

Table I-5 (Continued)

State Vocational Education
Governance Structures

State	State Board	Type	Administrative Agencies			Agency Authority	
			Agency	Board Reported To	Responsibility	Institutions	Authority
Colorado	State Board of Community Colleges and Occupational Education	Type II(c)	Division of Occupational Education	State Board of Community Colleges and Occupational Education	Model II	Comprehensive High Schools	Class III
						Area Vocational Schools - BOCES	Class III
			Division of Community Colleges	State Board of Community Colleges and Occupational Education	Model II	State Community Colleges	Class I
						Local District Junior Colleges	Class III
Connecticut	State Board for Vocational Education (State Board of Education)	Type IV(a)	Division of Vocational Education/State Department of Education	State Board of Education	Model II	Comprehensive High Schools	Class V
						Regional Vocational-Technical Schools	Class I
						Regional Vocational Agriculture Centers	Class II
			Board of Technical Colleges	Board of Technical Colleges	Model III	State Technical Colleges	Class I
			Board of Trustees for Regional Community Colleges	Board of Trustees for Regional Community Colleges	Model III	Community Colleges	Class I
Delaware	State Board for Vocational Education (State Board of Elementary and Secondary Education)	Type IV(a)	Division of Vocational Education/State Department of Education	State Board of Elementary and Secondary Education	Model II	Comprehensive High Schools	Class V
						Area Vocational Centers	Class V
			State Board of Trustees for the Delaware Technical and Community Colleges	State Board of Trustees for the Delaware Technical and Community Colleges	Model III	Technical and Community Colleges	Class II
District of Columbia	State Board for Vocational Education (Board of Education	Type II(c)	Division of Career Development Programs	District of Columbia Board of Education	Model I	Comprehensive High Schools	Class II
						Area Vocational High Schools	Class II

Table I-5 (Continued)

State Vocational Education
Governance Structures

State	State Board	Type	Administrative Agencies			Agency Authority	
			Agency	Board Reported To	Responsibility	Institutions	Authority
Florida	State Board for Vocational Education (State Board of Education)	Type IV(c)	Division of Public Schools/State Department of Education	State Board of Education	Model III	Comprehensive High Schools	Class V
			Division of Vocational Education/State Department of Education	State Board of Education	Model I/II	Area Vocational-Technical Centers	Class V
			Division of Community Colleges/State Department of Education	State Board of Education	Model III	Community Colleges	Class III
Georgia	State Board for Vocational Education (State Board of Education)	Type IV(c)	Office of Adult and Vocational Education/ State Department of Education	State Board of Education	Model IV	Comprehensive High Schools	Class V
						Area Vocational Centers	Class V
						Area Technical Schools	Class III
			State Board of Regents	State Board of Regents	Model III	Junior Colleges	Class IV
Hawaii	State Board of Vocational Education (State Board of Education)	Type III(c)	Director of Vocational Education	State Board of Education (NOTE A)	Model IV	Comprehensive High Schools	Class I
						Community Colleges	Class I
Idaho	State Board for Vocational Education (State Board of Education)	Type IV(c)	Department of Public Instruction	State Board of Education	Model III	Comprehensive High Schools	Class V
			Division of Vocational Education	State Board of Education	Model II	Area Vocational-Technical Schools	Class I
						Area Vocational-Technical Schools	Class II
			Colleges and Universities	State Board of Education	Model III	Area Vocational-Technical Schools	Class I
Illinois	State Board for Vocational Education (State Board of Education)	Type IV(a)	Department of Adult Vocational and Technical Education/State Department of Education	State Board of Education	Model V	Comprehensive High Schools	Class V
						Area Vocational Centers	Class V
			Community College Board	State Board of Higher Education	Model III	Community Colleges	Class V

NOTE A: Chief Executive Officer of Board is President of University of Hawaii who supervises Director of Vocational Education.

Table I-5 (Continued)

State Vocational Education Governance Structures

State	State Board	Type	Administrative Agencies			Agency Authority	
			Agency	Board Reported To	Responsibility	Institutions	Authority
Indiana	State Board of Vocational and Technical Education	Type I	Division of Vocational Education/State Department of Education	State Board of Education	Model III	Comprehensive High Schools	Class V
						Area Vocational Programs	Class V
			Indiana Vocational-Technical College System	Higher Education Commission	Model III	Regional Campuses, Indiana Vocational-Technical College System	Class II
Iowa	State Board for Vocational Education (State Board of Education)	Type IV(c)	Area School and Career Education Branch/Department of Public Instruction	State Board of Education	Model IV	Comprehensive High Schools	Class V
						Merged Area Schools	Class V
Kansas	State Board for Vocational Education (State Board of Education)	Type IV(c)	Division of Vocational Education/State Department of Education	State Board of Education	Model I	Comprehensive High Schools	Class V
						Area Vocational-Technical Schools - Type I	Class V
						Area Vocational-Technical Schools - Type II	Class V
						Community Junior Colleges	Class V
Kentucky	State Board for Vocational Education (State Board for Occupational Education)	Type II(c)	Bureau of Vocational Education/State Department of Education	State Board for Occupational Education	Model IV	Vocational Departments of Secondary Schools	Class V
						Area Vocational Education Centers	Class I
						State Vocational-Technical Schools	Class I
			University of Kentucky	Board of Trustees	Model III	Community Colleges	Class I
Louisiana	State Board for Vocational Education (State Board of Elementary and Secondary Education	Type IV(c)	Division of Vocational Education/State Department of Education	State Board for Elementary and Secondary Education	Model IV	Comprehensive High Schools	Class V
						Career Centers	Class V
						Postsecondary Vocational-Technical Institutions	Class I
			Delgado Community College	State Board for Higher Education	Model III	Community College	Class V

Table I-5 (Continued)

State Vocational Education
Governance Structures

State	State Board	Type	Administrative Agencies			Agency Authority	
			Agency	Board Reported To	Responsibility	Institutions	Authority
Maine	State Board for Vocational Education (State Board of Education)	Type IV(c)	Bureau of Vocational Education/State Department of Education and Cultural Services	State Board of Education	Model IV	Vocational Centers	Class I
						Vocational Regions	Class V
						Satellite Centers	Class V
						Vocational-Technical Institutes	Class I
Maryland	State Board for Vocational Education (State Board of Education)	Type IV(a)	Division of Vocational Education/State Department of Education	State Board of Education	Model II	Comprehensive High Schools	Class V
						Vocational High Schools	Class V
						Area Vocational Centers	Class V
			State Board of Community Colleges	State Board of Community Colleges	Model III	Community Colleges	Class V
Massachusetts	State Board of Vocational and Technical Education	Type IV(a)	Division of Occupational Education/State Department of Education	State Board of Education	Model II	Comprehensive High Schools	Class V
						Vocational High Schools	Class V
						Regional Vocational-Technical High Schools	Class V
			Board of Regional Community Colleges	Board of Regional Community Colleges	Model III	Community Colleges	Class I
Michigan	State Board for Vocational Education (State Board of Education)	Type IV(c)	Vocational-Technical Education Service/State Department of Education	State Board of Education	Model II	Comprehensive High Schools	Class V
						Area Vocational Centers	Class V
			Bureau of Higher Education Services	State Board of Education	Model III	Community Colleges	Class V
Minnesota	State Board for Vocational Education (State Board of Education)	Type IV(c)	Division of Vocational-Technical Education/ State Department of Education	State Board of Education	Model IV	Comprehensive High Schools	Class V
						Cooperative Centers	Class V
						Area Vocational-Technical Institutes	Class V
			State Board of Community Colleges	State Board of Community Colleges	Model III	Community Colleges	Class I

Table I-5 (Continued)

State Vocational Education
Governance Structures

State	State Board	Type	Administrative Agencies			Agency Authority	
			Agency	Board Reported To	Responsibility	Institutions	Authority
Mississippi	State Board for Vocational-Technical Education (State Board of Education)	Type IV(c)	Division of Vocational-Technical Education/ State Department of Education	State Board of Education	Model IV	Comprehensive High Schools	Class V
						Vocational Centers - Secondary Schools	Class V
						Vocational Centers - Junior Colleges	Class V
Missouri	State Board for Vocational-Technical Education (State Board of Education)	Type IV(c)	Division of Career and Adult Education	State Board of Education	Model IV	Comprehensive High Schools	Class V
						Area Vocational Centers	Class V
			Coordinating Board for Higher Education	Coordinating Board for Higher Education	Model	Junior Colleges	Class V
Montana	State Board for Vocational-Technical Education (State Board of Public Education)	Type IV(c)	Department of Vocational and Occupational Services/ Office of Public Instruction	State Board of Public Education	Model IV	Comprehensive High Schools	Class V
						Vocational-Technical Centers	Class III
			Board of Regents	State Board of Public Education	Model II	Community Colleges	Class V
Nebraska	State Board for Vocational Education (State Board of Education)	Type IV(a)	Division of Vocational Education/State Department of Education	State Board of Education	Model II	Comprehensive High Schools	Class V
			(Quasi-independent system of Technical Community Colleges)			Technical Community Colleges	Class V
Nevada	State Board for Vocational-Technical Education (State Board of Education)	Type IV(a)	Vocational and Adult Education Unit/State Department of Education	State Board of Education	Model II	Comprehensive High Schools	Class V
						Area Vocational-Technical School	Class V
			University of Nevada	Board of Regents	Model III	Community Colleges	Class I

Table I-5 (Continued)

State Vocational Education Governance Structures

State	State Board	Type	Administrative Agencies			Agency Authority	
			Agency	Board Reported To	Responsibility	Institutions	Authority
New Hampshire	State Board for Vocational-Technical Education (State Board of Education)	Type IV(c)	Division of Vocational Education/State Department of Education	State Board of Education	Model II	Comprehensive High Schools	Class V
						Area Vocational Centers	Class V
			Division of Postsecondary Education/State Department of Education	State Board of Education	Model II	Vocational-Technical Colleges	Class I
						Technical Institute	Class I
New Jersey	State Board for Vocational Education (State Board of Education)	Type IV(a)	Division of Vocational Education/State Department of Education	State Board of Education	Models II & IV	Comprehensive High Schools	Class V
						Area Vocational-Technical Schools	Class V
			Office of Community Colleges	Department of Higher Education	Model III	Community Colleges	Class V
New Mexico	State Board for Vocational-Technical Education (State Board of Education)	Type IV(c)	Division of Vocational-Technical Education/ State Department of Education	State Board of Education	Model IV	Comprehensive High Schools	Class V
						Area Vocational Schools	Class V
						Community and Junior Colleges	Class IV
New York	State Board for Vocational Education (State Board of Regents)	Type IV(c)	Division of Occupational- and Continuing Education	Board of Regents	Model IV	Comprehensive High Schools	Class V
						Vocational High Schools	Class V
						BOCES	Class V
						Community Colleges	Class V
						Agricultural and Technical Colleges	
North Carolina	State Board for Vocational Education (State Board of Education)	Type IV(c)	Division of Vocational Education/State Department of Education	State Board of Education	Model II	Comprehensive High Schools	Class V
						Shared-Time Centers	Class V
			Department of Community Colleges/State Department of Education	State Board of Education	Model III	Technical Institutes - Community Colleges	Class IV Class II

Table I-5 (Continued)

State Vocational Education Governance Structures

State	State Board	Type	Administrative Agencies			Agency Authority	
			Agency	Board Reported To	Responsibility	Institutions	Authority
North Dakota	State Board for Vocational Education	Type IV(c)	Department of Public Instruction	State Board of Education	Model III	Comprehensive High Schools	Class V
						Vocational Centers	Class V
			State Board for Vocational Education	State Board for Vocational Education	Model I	Independent Junior Colleges	Class V
			State Board of Higher Education	State Board of Higher Education	Model III	Junior Colleges	Class I
Ohio	State Board for Vocational Education (State Board of Education)	Type IV(a)	Division of Vocational Education/State Department of Education	State Board of Education	Model II	Comprehensive High Schools	Class V
						Joint Vocational School Districts	Class V
			Board of Regents	Board of Regents	Model III	Community Colleges	Class IV
						Technical Colleges	Class IV
						General and Technical Colleges	Class I
Oklahoma	State Board for Vocational and Technical Education	Type II(a)	Department of Vocational and Technical Education	State Board for Vocational and Technical Education	Model II	Comprehensive High Schools	Class V
						Area Vocational-Technical Schools	Class V
			State Regents for Higher Education	State Regents for Higher Education	Model III	Community and Junior Colleges	Class II
						Municipal Junior College (Tulsa)	Class IV
			Oklahoma State University	State Regents for Higher Education	Model III	Technical Institutes	Class II
Oregon	State Board for Vocational Education (State Board of Education)	Type IV(c)	Career and Vocational Education Services/State Department of Education	State Board of Education	Model II	Comprehensive High Schools	Class V
			Division of Career Colleges/State Department of Education	State Board of Education	Model II	Community Colleges	Class V

Table I-5 (Continued)

State Vocational Education Governance Structures

State	State Board	Type	Administrative Agencies			Agency Authority	
			Agency	Board Reported To	Responsibility	Institutions	Authority
Pennsylvania	State Board for Vocational Education (State Board of Education)	Type IV(c)	Bureau of Vocational Education/State Department of Education	State Board of Education	Model II	Comprehensive High Schools	Class V
						Vocational High Schools	Class V
						Area Vocational-Technical Schools	Class V
			Bureau of Career Colleges/ State Department of Education	State Board of Education	Model II	Community Colleges	Class V
Rhode Island	State Board for Vocational Education (State Board of Regents)	Type IV(c)	Division of Vocational Education/State Department of Education	Board of Regents	Model II	Area Vocational Facilities	Class V
						State Vocational Education School	Class I
			Bureau of Postsecondary Education/State Department of Education	Board of Regents	Model II	Junior College	Class I
South Carolina	State Board for Vocational Education (State Board of Education)	Type IV(a)	Office of Vocational Education/State Department of Education	State Board of Education	Model II	Comprehensive High Schools	Class V
						Area Vocational Centers	Class V
			State Board for Technical and Comprehensive Education	State Board for Technical and Comprehensive Education	Model III	Technical Colleges	Class IV
South Dakota	State Board for Vocational and Technical Education	Type II(c)	Division of Vocational-Technical Education	State Board for Vocational and Technical Education	Model IV	Comprehensive High Schools	Class V
						Multi-District Vocational Centers	Class III
						Vocational-Technical Schools	Class II
Tennessee	State Board for Vocational Education (State Board of Education)	Type IV(c)	Division of Vocational and Technical Education/ State Department of Education	State Board of Education	Model IV	Comprehensive High Schools	Class V
						Vocational Centers	Class III
						Area Vocational-Technical Schools	Class I
						Technical Institutes	Class II
			Board of Regents	Board of Regents	Model III	Community Colleges	Class II

Table I-5 (Continued)

State Vocational Education Governance Structures

State	State Board	Type	Administrative Agencies			Agency Authority	
			Agency	Board Reported To	Responsibility	Institutions	Authority
Texas	State Board for Vocational Education (State Board of Education)	Type IV(c)	Department of Occupational Education and Technology; Texas Education Agency	State Board of Education	Model V	Comprehensive High Schools	Class V
						Area Vocational Schools	Class V
				Coordinating Board; College and University System	Model III	Community (Junior) Colleges	Class V
			Texas State Technical Institutes	Board of Regents (TSTI); State Board of Education	Model III	Texas State Technical Institute	Class I
Utah	State Board for Vocational Education (State Board of Education)	Type IV(c)	Division of Vocational and Adult Education/ State Department of Education	State Board of Education	Model IV	Comprehensive High Schools	Class V
						Area Vocational Centers	Class II
						Technical Colleges	Class I
			Board of Regents	State Board of Education	Model III	Two-Year Colleges	Class II
Vermont	State Board for Vocational Education (State Board of Education)	Type IV(a)	Division of Vocational Education/State Department of Education	State Board of Education	Model II	High School/Area Vocational Centers	Class V
			Board of State Colleges	Board of State Colleges	Model III	Technical College	Class I
Virginia	State Board for Vocational Education (State Board of Education)	Type IV(a)	Division of Vocational Education/State Department of Education	State Board of Education	Model II	Comprehensive High Schools	Class V
						Area Vocational Centers	Class V
						Joint Vocational Centers	Class V
			Community College System	State Board of Community Colleges	Model III	Community Colleges	Class I
Washington	State Board for Vocational Education (Commission on Vocational Education)	Type I	State Department of Education	State Board of Education	Model III	Comprehensive High Schools	Class IV
						Area Vocational-Technical Institutes	Class IV
			State Board of Community Colleges	State Board of Community Colleges	Model III	Community Colleges	Class IV

Table I-5 (Continued)

State Vocational Education Governance Structures

State	State Board	Type	Administrative Agencies			Agency Authority	
			Agency	Board Reported To	Responsibility	Institutions	Authority
West Virginia	State Board for Vocational Education (State Board of Regents)	Type IV(c)	Bureau of Vocational and Adult Education/State Department of Education	State Board of Education	Model IV	Comprehensive High Schools	Class V
						County Vocational Centers	Class V
						Area Vocational Centers	Class V
			State College System	Board of Regents	Model III	Community Colleges	Class I
Wisconsin	State Board for Vocational Technical and Adult Education	Type III(b)	Bureau of Career and Manpower Development/ Department of Public Instruction	None	Model III	Comprehensive High Schools	Class V
						Regional Vocational Centers	Class V
			State Board of Vocational-Technical and Adult Education	State Board of Vocational-Technical and Adult Education	Model II	Vocational-Technical and Adult Education Districts	Class V
Wyoming	State Board of Vocational Education (State Department of Education)	Type IV(a)	Office of Occupational Education/State Department of Education	State Board of Education	Model I	Comprehensive High Schools	Class V
			State Community College Commission	State Community College Commission	Model I	Community Colleges	Class V
American Samoa	Samoan Board for Vocational Education (Board of Regents)	Type IV(c)	Department of Education	Board of Regents	Model I	Comprehensive High Schools	Class I
						Vocational Skill Center	Class I
			Department of Education	Board of Higher Education	Model I	Community College	Class I
Guam	Board for Vocational Education Control (State Board of Education)	Type IV(c)	Provost - Guam Community Colleges	State Board of Education	Model IV	Vocational Technical High School	Class I
			Provost - Guam Community Colleges	Board of Trustees (Community Colleges); Board of Regents	Model IV	Community College	Class I

Table I-5 (Continued)

State Vocational Education Governance Structures

State	State Board	Type	Administrative Agencies			Agency Authority	
			Agency	Board Reported To	Responsibility	Institutions	Authority
Puerto Rico	Board of Vocational-Technical Education	Type I	Area of Vocational and Technical Education	Board for Vocational-Technical Education	Model IV	Comprehensive High Schools	Class I
						Postsecondary Vocational-Technical Schools	Class I
						Technical Institutes	Class I
						Agricultural School	Class I
						Special Voc. Center	Class I
						Tool & Die Making School	Class I
Trust Territory	State Board for Vocational Education (Micronesia Board of Education)	Type IV(a)	Department of Vocational Education	Micronesia Board of Education	Model II	Comprehensive High School	Class II
			College of Micronesia	Board of Regents	Model III	Occupational Center	Class II
						Nursing School	Class II
						Community College	Class II
Virgin Islands	State Board for Vocational Education (State Board of Education)	Type IV(c)	Division of Vocational-Technical Education	State Board of Education	Model II	Comprehensive High Schools	Class I
			College of the Virgin Islands	Board of Trustees	Model III	College of the Virgin Islands	Class I

Table I-6

Provisions for Interagency Coordination Through Governing Board Memberships

State	Board	Membership Provisions
Alabama	State Board of Education	Single State Board of Education over all agencies responsible for vocational education
Alaska	State Board of Education	Single State Board of Education over all agencies responsible for vocational education
Arizona	Arizona Community College Board	Superintendent of Public Instruction and Associate Superintendent for Vocational Education (from Department of Education) are ex-officio members of the Arizona Community College Board Some Board members have dual appointments to Arizona Community College Board and State Board of Education (State Board for Vocational Education)
Arkansas	None specified	No provisions identified
California	None specified	No provisions identified
Colorado	State Board of Community Colleges and Occupational Education	Single State Board of Education over all agencies responsible for vocational education
Connecticut	State Board of Education	One member of the State Board of Technical Colleges serves as a member of the State Board of Education
Delaware	None specified	No provisions identified
District of Columbia	None specified	No provisions identified
Florida	State Board of Education	Single State Board of Education over all agencies responsible for vocational education
Georgia	None specified	No provisions identified
Hawaii	State Board of Education	Chief executive officer of the Board is President of the University of Hawaii
Idaho	State Board of Education	Single State Board of Education over all agencies responsible for vocational education
Illinois	Illinois Community College Board	State Superintendent of Education is ex-officio member of Illinois Community College Board

Table I-6 (Continued)

Provisions for Interagency Coordination Through Governing Board Memberships

State	Board	Membership Provisions
Indiana	State Board for Vocational and Technical Education	The Commissioner for Higher Education and the Superintendent for Public Instruction are designated, by law, as ex-officio members of the State Board and alternate annually as Chairperson of the Board
Iowa	State Board of Education	Single State Board of Education over all agencies responsible for vocational education
Kansas	State Board of Education	Single State Board of Education over all agencies responsible for vocational education
Kentucky	None specified	No provisions identified
Louisiana	None specified	No provisions identified
Maine	State Board of Education	Single State Board of Education over all agencies responsible for vocational education; Governor-appointed State Commissioner of Education is the executive officer
Maryland	None specified	No provisions identified
Massachusetts	Board of Regional Community Colleges	Commissioner of Education serves as an ex-officio member of Board of Regional Community Colleges
Michigan	State Board of Education	Single State Board of Education over all agencies responsible for vocational education
Minnesota	None specified	No provisions identified
Mississippi	State Board of Education	Single State Board of Education over all agencies responsible for vocational education
Missouri	None specified	No provisions identified
Montana	State Board of Public Instruction	Single State Board of Education over all agencies responsible for vocational education
Nebraska	None specified	No provisions identified
Nevada	None specified	No provisions identified
New Hampshire	State Board of Education	Single State Board of Education over all agencies responsible for vocational education

Table 1-6 (Continued)

Provisions for Interagency Coordination
Through Governing Board Memberships

State	Board	Membership Provisions
New Jersey	None specified	No provisions identified
New Mexico	State Board of Education	Single State Board of Education over all agencies responsible for vocational education
New York	Board of Regents of the University of the State of New York	Single State Board of Education over all agencies responsible for vocational education
North Carolina	State Board of Education	Single State Board of Education over all agencies responsible for vocational education
North Dakota	State Board of Vocational Education	Membership consists of the members of the State Board of Education but who is independently as the State Board of Vocational Education. The State Director of Vocational Education is the executive officer; the State Superintendent of Public Instruction is an ex-officio member of the Board
Ohio	None specified	No provisions identified
Oklahoma	None specified	No provisions identified
Oregon	State Board of Education	Single State Board of Education over all agencies responsible for vocational education
Pennsylvania	State Board of Education	Single State Board of Education over all agencies responsible for vocational education
Rhode Island	State Board of Education	Single State Board of Education over all agencies responsible for vocational education
South Carolina	State Board for Technical and Comprehensive Education	State Superintendent of Education serves as an ex-officio member of the State Board for Technical and Comprehensive Education
South Dakota	State Board for Vocational and Technical Education	One member of the Board of Regents (for higher education) and one member from the Board of Elementary and Secondary Education serve as members of the State Board for Vocational and Technical Education
Tennessee	None specified	No provisions identified

Table 1-6 (Continued)

Provisions for Interagency Coordination
Through Governing Board Memberships

State	Board	Membership Provisions
Texas	None specified	No provisions identified
Utah	State Board of Education	Single State Board of Education over all agencies responsible for vocational education
Vermont	None specified	No provisions identified
Virginia	None specified	No provisions identified
Washington	Commission on Vocational Education	Superintendent of Public Instruction and the Director of the State Board of Community Colleges are ex-officio members of the Commission on Vocational Education
West Virginia	None specified	No provisions identified
Wisconsin	State Board for Vocational, Technical and Adult Education	The Superintendent of Public Instruction, the Chairman of the Board of Regents and Head of the Department of Industry, Labor and Human Relations serve on the State Board for Vocational, Technical, and Adult Education as ex-officio members
Wyoming	State Community College Commission	State Superintendent of Education is an ex-officio member
American Samoa	State Board of Education	Single State Board of Education over all agencies responsible for vocational education
Guam	State Board of Education	Single State Board of Education over all agencies responsible for vocational education
Puerto Rico	State Board of Vocational and Technical Education	President of the University of Puerto Rico serves as an ex-officio member
Trust Territory	State Board of Education	Single State Board of Education over all agencies responsible for vocational education
Virgin Islands	State Board of Education	Single State Board of Education over all agencies responsible for vocational education

Table I-7

Structured Provisions for Direct Agency Interaction
for Vocational Education

State	Agencies Involved	Provision for Interaction
Alabama	None specified	No provisions identified
Alaska	None specified	No provisions identified
Arizona	None specified	No provisions identified
Arkansas	None specified	No provisions identified
California	California Manpower Information System; Division of Academic Affairs and Family Planning; Division of Administration; Division of Analytical Studies; Division of Governmental Affairs	A planning group to promote information sharing
Colorado	State Board of Education; State Board of Community Colleges and Occupational Education	Meetings are held regularly (at least annually) to identify common practices and purposes and to eliminate duplication
	Department of Education; Divisions of Community Colleges and Occupational Education; Commission for Higher Education; Department of Labor; Vocational Rehabilitation Department	Meetings are held annually to determine agency responsibility for specific data acquisition
Connecticut	State Board for Technical Colleges; State Board of Trustees for Regional Community Colleges	Representatives of the Technical Colleges and Community Colleges make up a "Board of Technical Coordinating Councils" to provide policy coordination
Delaware	State Department of Education; State Board of Trustees of the Delaware Technical and Community Colleges	Joint participation in the development of the "State Plan for Vocational Education"

Table I-7 (Continued)

Structured Provisions for Direct Agency Interaction
for Vocational Education

State	Agencies Involved	Provision for Interaction
District of Columbia	None specified	No provisions identified
Florida	None specified	No provisions identified
Georgia	None specified	No provisions identified
Hawaii	Department of Education; Manpower Commission; Superintendent and Chancellor of Community Colleges	Advises on the operation of the State's vocational education delivery system
Idaho	Division of Vocational Education; State Board of Education	State Superintendent of Public Instruction serves as an ex-officio executive officer of the Board of Education to coordinate activities
Illinois	Department of Adult Vocational and Technical Education; Illinois Community College Board	A staff member of the State Board of Education serves as an ex-officio staff member of the Illinois Career College Board
Indiana	None specified	No provisions identified
Iowa	None specified	No provisions identified
Kansas	None specified	No provisions identified
Kentucky	None specified	No provisions identified
Louisiana	None specified	No provisions identified
Maine	None specified	No provisions identified
Maryland	None specified	No provisions identified
Massachusetts	None specified	No provisions identified
Michigan	None specified	No provisions identified
Minnesota	None specified	No provisions identified
Mississippi	None specified	No provisions identified

Table I-7 (Continued)

Structured Provisions for Direct Agency Interaction
for Vocational Education

State	Agencies Involved	Provision for Interaction
Missouri	None specified	No provisions identified
Montana	None specified	No provisions identified
Nebraska	None specified	No provisions identified
Nevada	None specified	No provisions identified
New Hampshire	None specified	No provisions identified
New Jersey	None specified	No provisions identified
New Mexico	None specified	No provisions identified
New York	None specified	No provisions identified
North Carolina	Division of Vocational Education; Department of Community Colleges	State Director serves as associate Vice President in the Department of Community Colleges in addition to being head of the Division of Vocational Education
North Dakota	Board for Vocational Education; Board of Higher Education	Regularly scheduled staff meetings between agencies
Ohio	None specified	No provisions identified
Oklahoma	State Board for Vocational-Technical Education; Regents for Higher Education	State Board for Vocational-Technical Education maintains a staff person in the office of the Oklahoma Regents for Higher Education
Oregon	None specified	No provisions identified
Pennsylvania	None specified	No provisions identified
Rhode Island	None specified	No provisions identified
South Carolina	None specified	No provisions identified
South Dakota	None specified	No provisions identified
Tennessee	Area Vocational-Technical Schools; Community Colleges; Technical Institutes	"Coordinating Committee" promotes development of articulated programs and avoidance of duplication

Table I-7 (Continued)

Structured Provisions for Direct Agency Interaction
for Vocational Education

State	Agencies Involved	Provision for Interaction
Texas	None specified	No provisions identified
Utah	State Department of Education; State Board of Regents	Chief State School Officer and Commissioner of Higher Education meet monthly
		Associate State Superintent serves as liaison to the Board of Regents for coordinating the administration of Technical Colleges
	Division of Vocational and Adult Education; State Board of Regents	Formal joint review of programs at the postsecondary level
Vermont	None specified	No provisions identified
Virginia	None specified	No provisions identified
Washington	None specified	No provisions identified
West Virginia	None specified	No provisions identified
Wisconsin	State Board for Vocational, Technical, and Adult Education; Board of Regents	Board maintaining three "joint administrative committees" for planning coordination in programs, facilities, and continuing education
Wyoming	None specified	No provisions identified
American Samoa	None specified	No provisions identified
Guam	None specified	No provisions identified
Puerto Rico	State Division of Vocational Education; Director of Colleges; Director of Industrial Services; Director of the Right to Employment Administration	Agencies participate in a planning commission for the purpose of coordinating program planning between the Department of Public Instruction, the University of Puerto Rico, and other agencies
Trust Territory	None specified	No provisions identified
Virgin Islands	None specified	No provisions identified

Table I-8

Legislatively Established Coordinating Agencies Affecting Vocational Education

State	Agency	Year Created	Basis of Creation	Membership
Alabama	None specified	--	--	No provisions identified
Alaska	None specified	--	--	No provisions identified
Arizona	None specified	--	--	No provisions identified
Arkansas	"Coordinating Committee"	1975	Legislation	Representative from Department of Education and Coordinating Commission on Higher Education Finance
California	None specified	--	--	No provisions identified
Colorado	None specified	--	--	No provisions identified
Connecticut	None specified	--	--	No provisions identified
Delaware	Council of Presidents of Higher Education Institutions	1972	Legislation	Presidents of higher education institutions and the chief State school officer
District of Columbia	None specified	--	--	No provisions identified
Florida	None specified	--	--	No provisions identified
Georgia	None specified	--	--	No provisions identified
Hawaii	None specified	--	--	No provisions identified
Idaho	None specified	--	--	No provisions identified
Illinois	Joint Coordinating Committee	DNA	DNA	Three members of the State Board of Education and three members of the State Board of Higher Education
Indiana	None specified	--	--	No provisions identified
Iowa	None specified	--	--	No provisions identified
Kansas	None specified	--	--	No provisions identified
Kentucky	None specified	--	--	No provisions identified
Louisiana	None specified	--	--	No provisions identified
Maine	None specified	--	--	No provisions identified
Maryland	None specified	--	--	No provisions identified
Massachusetts	None specified	--	--	No provisions identified
Michigan	None specified	--	--	No provisions identified
Minnesota	Higher Education Coordinating Board	DNA	Legislation	Independently constituted
Mississippi	None specified	--	--	No provisions identified
Missouri	None specified	--	--	No provisions identified
Montana	None specified	--	--	No provisions identified
Nebraska	Postsecondary Education Coordinating Committee	1976	Legislation	DNA

DNA: Data not available.

Table I-8 (Continued)

Legislatively Established Coordinating Agencies Affecting Vocational Education

State	Agency	Year Created	Basis of Creation	Membership
Nevada	None specified	--	--	No provisions identified
New Hampshire	Joint Management Committee	DNA	DNA	Representatives of the Division of Postsecondary Education and the Board of Trustees of the University of New Hampshire
New Jersey	None specified	--	--	No provisions identified
New Mexico	None specified	--	--	No provisions identified
New York	None specified	--	--	No provisions identified
North Carolina	None specified	--	--	No provisions identified
North Dakota	Postsecondary Education Commission	DNA	DNA	Board for Vocational Education, Board of Higher Education, representatives of independent postsecondary institutions
Ohio	None specified	--	--	No provisions identified
Oklahoma	None specified	--	--	No provisions identified
Oregon	Oregon Education Coordinating Commission	1975	Legislation	DNA (no State vocational staff representing the State Board of Education are members)
Pennsylvania	Vocational Education Policy Committee	DNA	DNA	Secretary of Education, Commissioner of Higher Education, Commissioner of Basic Education, State Director of Vocational Education, and Director of the Bureau of Higher Education Academic Programs
Rhode Island	None specified	--	--	No provisions identified
South Carolina	None specified	--	--	No provisions identified
South Dakota	None specified	--	--	No provisions identified
Tennessee	None specified	--	--	No provisions identified
Texas	None specified	--	--	No provisions identified
Utah	None specified	--	--	No provisions identified
Vermont	None specified	--	--	No provisions identified
Virginia	None specified	--	--	No provisions identified
Washington	None specified	--	--	No provisions identified
West Virginia	None specified	--	--	No provisions identified
Wisconsin	None specified	--	--	No provisions identified
Wyoming	None specified	--	--	No provisions identified
American Samoa	None specified	--	--	No provisions identified
Guam	None specified	--	--	No provisions identified
Puerto Rico	None specified	--	--	No provisions identified
Trust Territory	None specified	--	--	No provisions identified
Virgin Islands	None specified	--	--	No provisions identified

DNA: Data not available.

Table I-9

Interagency Policy Agreements Affecting Vocational Education Programs and Services

State	Agencies	Year	Basis	Provision
Alabama	None specified	--	--	No provisions identified
Alaska	None specified	--	--	No provisions identified
Arizona	None specified	--	--	No provisions identified
Arkansas	None specified	--	--	No provisions identified
California	None specified	--	--	No provisions identified
Colorado	None specified	--	--	No provisions identified
Connecticut	State Board of Technical Colleges; State Board of Trustees for Regional Community Colleges	DNA	Mission Statement	Agreement that the Technical Colleges are the primary vehicle for delivering post-secondary technical education
Delaware	None specified	--	--	No provisions identified
District of Columbia	None specified	--	--	No provisions identified
Florida	None specified	--	--	No provisions identified
Georgia	Office of Adult and Vocational Education; State Board of Regents	DNA	Joint Agreement	Provide that the Office of Adult and Vocational Education will fund programs of postsecondary vocational education conducted by junior colleges under policies established by the Office of Adult and Vocational Education
Hawaii	None specified	--	--	No provisions identified
Idaho	None specified	--	--	No provisions identified
Illinois	None specified	--	--	No provisions identified
Indiana	None specified	--	--	No provisions identified
Iowa	None specified	--	--	No provisions identified
Kansas	None specified	--	--	No provisions identified
Kentucky	None specified	--	--	No provisions identified
Louisiana	None specified	--	--	No provisions identified
Maine	None specified	--	--	No provisions identified
Maryland	None specified	--	--	No provisions identified
Massachusetts	Division of Occupational Education/State Department of Education; Board of Higher Education	1971	Joint Agreement	Defines criteria and procedures relating to postsecondary vocational education
	Division of Occupational Education/ State Department of Education; Board of Regional County Colleges	1977	Joint Agreement	Development of cooperation and integration of program services at the local level
Michigan	None specified	--	--	No provisions identified
Minnesota	None specified	--	--	No provisions identified
Mississippi	None specified	--	--	No provisions identified
Missouri	None specified	--	--	No provisions identified
Montana	None specified	--	--	No provisions identified
Nebraska	None specified	--	--	No provisions identified
Nevada	None specified	--	--	No provisions identified

DNA: Data not available.

Table I-9 (Continued)

Interagency Policy Agreements Affecting Vocational Education Programs and Services

State	Agencies	Year	Basis	Provision
New Hampshire	None specified	--	--	No provisions identified
New Jersey	None specified	--	--	No provisions identified
New Mexico	None specified	--	--	No provisions identified
New York	None specified	--	--	No provisions identified
North Carolina	Department of Community Colleges; Division of Vocational Education	DNA	Board Policy	Authorization for programs in postsecondary institutions predicated on demonstration of non-interference of secondary school programs
North Dakota	None specified	--	--	No provisions identified
Ohio	Ohio Department of Education; Ohio Board of Regents	DNA	Mission	Provides for coordinated program development Statement
Oklahoma	State Board for Vocational-Technical Education; Regents for Higher Education	1972 (1973)	Joint Agreement	Defines roles and responsibilities of State agencies vis-a-vis vocational education programs (Statute)
Oregon	None specified	--	--	No provisions identified
Pennsylvania	None specified	--	--	No provisions identified
Rhode Island	None specified	--	--	No provisions identified
South Carolina	None specified	--	--	No provisions identified
South Dakota	None specified	--	--	No provisions identified
Tennessee	None specified	--	--	No provisions identified
Texas	Texas Education Agency; Coordinating Board; Texas College and University System	DNA	Cooperative Agreement	Community college located in county of a campus of Texas State Technical Institute must "sign-off" before Texas State Technical Institute initiates new programs in county
Utah	None specified	--	--	No provisions identified
Vermont	None specified	--	--	No provisions identified
Virginia	State Board of Education; State Board of Community Colleges	1972	Cooperative Agreement	Responsibilities for local planning requirements for community colleges
Washington	None specified	--	--	No provisions identified
West Virginia	Bureau of Vocational, Technical and Adult Education; Board of Regents	1977	Cooperative Agreement	Coordinated development of programs provided for
Wisconsin	State Board for Vocational, Technical and Adult Education	DNA	Legislation	The Board is responsible for all vocational and technical programs below the baccalaureate level and must approve all vocational programs conducted in the university system
Wyoming	None specified	--	--	No provisions identified
American Samoa	None specified	--	--	No provisions identified
Guam	None specified	--	--	No provisions identified
Puerto Rico	None specified	--	--	No provisions identified
Trust Territory	None specified	--	--	No provisions identified
Virgin Islands	None specified	--	--	No provisions identified

DNA: Data not available.

Table I-10

Informal Provisions for Direct Agency Interaction for Vocational Education

State	Agencies Involved	Provision for Interaction
Alabama	None specified	No information provided
Alaska	None specified	No information provided
Arizona	Division of Vocational Education; Arizona Community College Board	Associate Director of Educational Services, Community College Board attends all monthly meetings of the Division of Vocational Education Division of Vocational Education (State Board of Education) has a "liaison" person assigned to work with the Community College Board
Arkansas	None specified	No information provided
California	None specified	No information provided
Colorado	None specified	No information provided
Connecticut	None specified	No information provided
Delaware	State Department of Education; State Board of Trustees of the Delaware Technical and Community Colleges	Semi-annual meetings are held involving representatives from selected institutions that participate in the formulation of program funding and priorities
District of Columbia	None specified	No information provided
Florida	None specified	No information provided
Georgia	None specified	No information provided
Hawaii	None specified	No information provided
Idaho	None specified	No information provided
Illinois	Department of Adult Vocational and Technical Education; Illinois Community College Board	Direct staff interaction exists between the Department of Adult Vocational and Technical Education and the Illinois Community College Board A staff specialist in career education from the Illinois Community College Board serves as a "liaison" person to the Department of Adult Vocational and Technical Education
Indiana	None specified	No information provided
Iowa	None specified	No information provided
Kansas	None specified	No information provided
Kentucky	None specified	No information provided
Louisiana	None specified	No information provided
Maine	None specified	No information provided
Maryland	None specified	No information provided
Massachusetts	None specified	No information provided
Michigan	None specified	No information provided
Minnesota	None specified	No information provided
Mississippi	None specified	No information provided
Missouri	None specified	No information provided
Montana	None specified	No information provided

Table I-10 (Continued)

Informal Provisions for Direct Agency Interaction for Vocational Education

State	Agencies Involved	Provision for Interaction
Nebraska	None specified	No information provided
Nevada	None specified	No information provided
New Hampshire	None specified	No information provided
New Jersey	Division of Vocational Education; Department of Higher Education	Staff interaction provides for coordination of program planning through informal agreements and joint programming efforts
New Mexico	None specified	No information provided
New York	None specified	No information provided
North Carolina	None specified	No information provided
North Dakota	None specified	No information provided
Ohio	None specified	No information provided
Oklahoma	None specified	No information provided
Oregon	None specified	No information provided
Pennsylvania	None specified	No information provided
Rhode Island	None specified	No information provided
South Carolina	Office of Vocational Education; State Board for Technical and Comprhensive Education	Staff interaction to promote joint planning between the two systems at the local level
South Dakota	None specified	No information provided
Tennessee	None specified	No information provided
Texas	None specified	No information provided
Utah	None specified	No information provided
Vermont	None specified	No information provided
Virginia	None specified	No information provided
Washington	None specified	No information provided
West Virginia	None specified	No information provided
Wisconsin	None specified	No information provided
Wyoming	None specified	No information provided
American Samoa	None specified	No information provided
Guam	None specified	No information provided
Puerto Rico	None specified	No information provided
Trust Territory	None specified	No information provided
Virgin Islands	None specified	No information provided

Table I-11

Changes in State Education Agencies Affecting Vocational Education

State	Year	Basis		Change
Alabama	1975	Policy of Board	Pre-1975:	Junior and Community Colleges were under the Division of Vocational Education
			Post-1975:	A separate Division of Postsecondary and Continuing Education with responsibility for the junior and community colleges was created within the Department of Education
Alaska	1975	Agency Reorganization	Pre-1975:	Vocational Education was administered a separate operating division within the Department of Education
			Post-1975:	Division of Career and Vocational education integrated into the total educational system
Arizona	1968	Legislation	Pre-1968:	Vocational education existed as a separate Department of Vocational Education
			Post-1968:	The Department of Vocational Education was merged with the State Office of Education and became the Division of Career and Vocational Education in the State Department of Education
Arkansas	1965	Legislation	Pre-1965:	All postsecondary education was the responsibility of the State Board of Education
			Post-1965:	State Community Junior College Board created to administer (coordinate) the community college system
California	1967	Legislation	Pre-1967:	State Board of Education had responsibility for all education through grade 14
			Post-1967:	The Board of Governors for Community Colleges was established to administer the newly established State community college system
Colorado	1967	Legislation	Pre-1967:	Vocational education policy administered by a Division of Vocational Education within the State Department of Education
			Post-1967:	The State Board of Community Colleges and Occupational Education was established as an independent board for community colleges and vocational education in all State institutions
Connecticut	1965	Legislation	Pre-1965:	All vocational education was the responsibility of the State Board of Education
			Post-1965:	The State Board of Trustees for Regional Community Colleges was established to be responsible for a State system of community colleges. (Postsecondary vocational education in State administered institutions continued to be under the State Board of Education.)
			Pre-1974:	Technical Colleges are administered by the Division of Vocational Education in the State Department of Education
			Post-1974:	The State Board for Technical Colleges was established to administer the separate system of Technical Colleges
Delaware	--	--	-- --	No significant changes affecting State governance of vocational education have occurred since 1963
District of Columbia	1970	Legislation	Pre-1970:	District of Columbia public schools had a Department of Vocational Education
			Post-1970:	The Division of Career Development Programs -- which has all career oriented programs and services in its offices -- was incorporated into the Department of Education
Florida	1969	Agency Reorganization	Pre-1969:	Community colleges were administered by local education agencies under the authority of the Division of Public Schools Vocational education was administered as a "section" within the Division of Public Schools
			Post-1969:	Community colleges are established as a separate educational system under the responsibility of the Division of Community Colleges The Division of Vocational Education was established as an independent administrative agency

DNA: Data not available.

Table I-11 (Continued)

Changes in State Education Agencies Affecting Vocational Education

State	Year	Basis	Change	
Georgia	1973	State Superintendent's Policy	Pre-1973:	The Division of Vocational Education in the Office of Instructional Services of the State Department of Education
			Post-1973:	The Office of Adult and Vocational Education was established as a separate agency responsible for all adult and vocational education
Hawaii	1965	Legislation	Pre-1965:	Vocational education (and the Director of Vocational Education) reported to the Department of Education's Superintendent of Schools
			Post-1965:	Director of Vocational Education reported to Vice President for Community Colleges
	1974	DNA	Pre-1974:	Director of Vocational Education reported to Vice President for Community Colleges
			Post-1974:	Director of Vocational Education reports to President of the University of Hawaii
Idaho	--	--	-- --	No significant changes affecting State governance of vocational education have occurred since 1963
Illinois	1965	Legislation	Pre-1965:	Community College governed by local educational agencies under the authority of the State Board of Education
			Post-1965:	The Illinois Community College Board was established to administer the State community college system
	1975	Legislation	Pre-1975:	There existed a separate State Board for Vocational Education
			Post-1975:	The Department of Adult Vocational and Technical Education was created within the State Department of Education
Indiana	1963	Legislation	Pre-1963:	Postsecondary vocational education delivered by secondary schools and colleges and universities
			Post-1963:	Postsecondary vocational education institutions were placed under the authority of the newly established Indiana Vocational-Technical College system
	1965	Legislation	Pre-1965:	The General Commission of the State Board of Education served as the designated State Board of Vocational Education
			Post-1965:	The State Board of Vocational and Technical Education was established as an independent administrative agency
Iowa	--	--	-- --	No significant changes affecting State governance of vocational education have occurred since 1963
Kansas	1968	Legislation	Pre-1968:	Vocational Education was administered as a separate State agency by the State Board for Vocational Education (which was composed of the same persons as on the State Board of Education)
			Post-1968:	The Division of Vocational education was made a part of the State Department of Education under the jurisdiction of the State Superintendent of Education
Kentucky	1977	Executive Order	Pre-1977:	The State Board of Education served as the State Board of Vocational-Technical Education
			Post-1977:	A separate State Board of Occupational Education was created, to which the Department of Education reports with respect to Vocational Education policies
Louisiana	1975	Constitutional Amendment	Pre-1975:	All vocational education was under the authority of the State Board of Education. Postsecondary vocational-technical institutions operated as semi-independent institutions
			Post-1975:	A new Board structure strengthened and centralized control over secondary institutions

DNA: Data not available.

Table I-11 (Continued)

Changes in State Education Agencies Affecting Vocational Education

State	Year	Basis	Change	
Maine	1972	Legislation	Pre-1972:	Bureau of Vocational Education existed as the Division of Vocational Education established as the State Department of Education and Cultural Services
			Post-1972:	Bureau of Vocational Education established as the State Department of Education and Cultural Services
Maryland	--	--	--	-- No significant changes affecting State governance of vocational education have occurred since 1963
Massachusetts	--	--	--	-- No significant changes affecting State governance of vocational education have occurred since 1963
Michigan	1978	Legislation	Pre-1978:	All secondary and postsecondary vocational education services were responsibility of the Vocational-Technical Education Service
			Post-1978:	The management of the postsecondary unit of the Vocational-Technical Education Service was relocated to the Bureau of Higher Education Services
Minnesota	--	--	--	-- No significant changes affecting State governance of vocational education have occurred since 1963
Mississippi	--	--	--	-- No significant changes affecting State governance of vocational education have occurred since 1963
Missouri	1974	Legislation	Pre-1974:	Junior colleges reported to the State Board of Education
			Post-1974:	Junior colleges report to the coordinating Board for Higher Education
Montana	1972	Agency Reorganization	Pre-1972:	Vocational education was administered as a bureau within the Instructional Services Division of the State Board of Education
			Post-1972:	The Department of Vocational and Occupational Services was established as a separate agency within the Office of Public Instruction
Nebraska	1973	Legislation	Pre-1973:	All vocational education was coordinated within the Division of Vocational Education
			Post-1973:	Legislation established a State Board for Technical Community Colleges. This Board was disbanded in 1977
Nevada	1974	Agency Reorganization	Pre-1974:	Division of Vocational-Technical Education was a separate agency reporting directly to the State superintendent
			Post-1974:	The Vocational and Adult Unit was established within the Office of Accountability and no longer reports directly to the State superintendent
New Hampshire	1972	Legislation	Pre-1972:	Postsecondary institutions were under Division of Vocational Education in Department of Education
			Post-1972:	Legislation established a separate Division of Postsecondary Education in Department of Education
New Jersey	--	--	--	-- No significant changes affecting State governance of vocational education have occurred since 1963
New Mexico	1975	Agency Reorganization	Pre-1975:	The Division of Vocational-Technical Education was an independent agency in the State Department of Education
			Post-1975:	The Division of Vocational-Technical Education was placed within the Instructional Division of the State Department of Education
New York	--	--	--	-- No significant changes affecting State governance of vocational education have occurred since 1963

DNA: Data not available.

Table I-11 (Continued)

Changes in State Education Agencies Affecting Vocational Education

State	Year	Basis		Change
North Carolina	1957	Legislation	Pre-1957:	Postsecondary technical education was a function of the Division of Vocational Education
			Post-1957:	Postsecondary technical education was authorized in two-year institutions
	1963	Legislation	Pre-1963:	Two-year postsecondary educational system was under a separate Board of Higher Education
			Post-1963:	Two-year postsecondary educational system was placed under the newly established Department of Community Colleges in the State Department of Education
North Dakota	--	--	-- --	No significant changes affecting State governance of vocational education have occurred since 1963
Ohio	1963	Legislation	Pre-1963:	Postsecondary technical education was the responsibility of the Division of Vocational Education
			Post-1963:	Community Colleges placed under the newly created Board of Regents for Higher Education
Oklahoma	1967	Legislation	Pre-1967:	Department of Vocational Education was a part of the State Department of Education
			Post-1967:	The State Board of Vocational-Technical Education was established as an independent agency
Oregon	1972	DNA	Pre-1972:	Vocational education was administered under an Associate Superintendent for Community Colleges and Vocational Education
			Post-1972:	Career and Vocational Education established as a section within the Instructional Service Division in the State Department of Education
				A separate Division of Community Colleges was established reporting to the State Superintendent of Public Instruction
Pennsylvania	--	--	-- --	No significant changes affecting State governance of vocational education have occurred since 1963
Rhode Island	1971	Agency Reorganization	Pre-1971:	Vocational education was administered by a separate Division of Vocational Education
			Post-1971:	Vocational education became a unit within the State Board of Regents for Education
South Carolina	1972	Legislation	Pre-1972:	Technical education was the responsibility of the State Board of Education
			Post-1972:	The State technical college system "board" was established as a separate Board for Technical and Comprehensive Education in 1972
South Dakota	1973	Legislation	Pre-1973:	State Board of Elementary and Secondary Education sat as State Board for Vocational Education
			Post-1973:	An independent board was established to serve as the State Board for Vocational and Technical education
Tennessee	--	--	-- --	No significant changes affecting State governance of vocational education have occurred since 1963
Texas	--	--	-- --	No significant changes affecting State governance of vocational education have occurred since 1963
Utah	--	--	-- --	No significant changes affecting State governance of vocational education have occurred since 1963
Vermont	--	--	-- --	No significant changes affecting State governance of vocational education have occurred since 1963

DNA: Data not available.

Table I-11 (Continued)

Changes in State Education Agencies Affecting Vocational Education

State	Year	Basis		Change
Virginia	1965	Legislation	Pre-1965:	Two-year colleges and technical institutes were under the control of individual State supported four year colleges
			Post-1965:	A separate State Board for Community Colleges was established to be responsible for all two-year college programs
Washington	1967	Legislation	Pre-1967:	An independent State Board for Vocational Education administered all vocational education programs
			Post-1967:	The Coordinating Council for Occupational Education was created. The name was changed to the Commission on Vocational Education in 1975
West Virginia	--	--	-- --	No significant changes affecting State governance of vocational education have occurred since 1963
Wisconsin	--	--	-- --	No significant changes affecting State governance of vocational education have occurred since 1963
Wyoming	1969	Reorganization	Pre-1969:	The Office of Occupational Education was operated as a separate Division of Vocational Education which reported directly to the Assistant Superintendent of Education
			Post-1969:	Program responsibilities of the Division of Vocational Education were integrated with other units of State Department of Education and the Office of Occupational Education serves as an administrative unit
American Samoa	1970	DNA	Pre-1970:	Department of Education controlled all vocational education
			Post-1970:	The Board of Higher Education was assigned responsibility for vocational education
			Pre-1977:	The Board of Higher Education held responsibility for vocational education
			Post-1977:	Responsibilities for vocational education transferred to the Board of Regents
Guam	1978	Legislation	Pre-1978:	Director of Vocational Education reported to the Department of Education and, hence, the Board of Education
			Post-1978:	The Provost of Guam Community College directs all vocational education at both secondary and postsecondary levels
Puerto Rico	1973	Legislation	Pre-1973:	State Board of Vocational-Technical Education was subordinate to the State Board of Education
			Post-1973:	The State Board of Education was disbanded, leaving the Board for Vocational Technical Education as an independent Board
Trust Territory	1978	DNA	Pre-1978:	Department of Vocational Education had responsibility for all vocational education
			Post-1978:	Responsibility for postsecondary vocational education is with the College of Micronesia which reports directly to the Board of Regents
Virgin Islands	--	--	-- --	No significant changes affecting State governance of vocational education have occurred since 1963

DNA: Data not available.

CHAPTER II

ORGANIZATION AND GOVERNANCE OF LOCAL VOCATIONAL INSTITUTIONS AND DELIVERY SYSTEMS

The delivery of vocational education services is a function of State and local institutions and vocational education delivery systems. In spite of the provisions of State and Federal legislation and policy, it is at the institutional level that services are rendered and the outcome of State and Federal policy determined.

While the institutions that provide vocational education have much in common at the program level (i.e., curriculum content, teaching methods, etc.), there are significant differences that exist in the organizational characteristics of these institutions. These differences result from the vocational education delivery systems of the 56 States and Territories that have been developed within the constraints of widely diverse legislative and policy provisions. Consequently, the institutions and delivery systems that make up the vocational education delivery systems of the States and Territories are as diverse as the State and Territories themselves.

In the development of this study, it was hypothesized that the effectiveness of State and Federal vocational education legislation and policy could be shown to have a high correlation with characteristics of the institution and/or delivery system. To date, however, no study has ever sought to test this hypothesis and identify the characteristics of institutions and delivery system that correlate with program effectiveness.

One of the reasons for the absence of any such studies is the absence of information about the organization and governance of different types of institutions and delivery systems that have been developed by the individual States and Territories. Initially, it was an objective of this study to test the hypothesis of association between institutional, organizational, and governance characteristics and measures of facility utilization and other characteristics of program operation. As the complexity and diversity of the vocational education systems of the States and Territories was revealed, however, it became apparent that few, if any, meaningful conclusions could be drawn from such an analysis.

Nevertheless, this examination of the organization and governance of vocational education institutions and delivery systems has resulted in the identification of a variety of characteristics that clearly are important descriptors of these programs. The data presented in this chapter, therefore, is intended to provide a basis for conducting further studies of vocational education institutions and delivery systems by:

- Providing a set of classifications that may be used to describe the different types of institutions and delivery systems, and their governance structure and status as fiscal agents.

- Describing the institutions and delivery systems of each State in terms of these characteristics.

The vocational education delivery systems of the 56 States and Territories may be described by at least six (6) different types of public educational institutions. These institutions are organized to provide vocational education through approximately 13 vocational education delivery system/types that serve students through four (4) different types of regional service arrangements.

Tables II-1, II-2, and II-3, respectively, provide definitions for the different types of institutions, the different regionalized service programs employed in the delivery of vocational education and the different classes of delivery systems.

Table II-4 describes the vocational education delivery system found in each State and Territory in terms of the institutional types, delivery system/types, and regional service arrangements employed in each. (Note: Institutions responding to the mailed survey instrument classified themselves according to definitions provided in Table II-1. Since institutions did not always classify themselves in the same way in which they were classified by State Agencies, institutional type summaries as presented in the tables in Chapters VI through IX, may not correspond to the total numbers of institutions reported in Table II-4.) Table II-5 summarizes the distribution of institutions by type and State or Territory.

In addition to the 312 possible combinations of institutional characteristics represented in Tables II-1 through II-3, vocational education institutions and delivery systems are operated under the authority of eight (8) different classes of governing authorities reflecting seven (7) different characteristics of governing authority composition. These institutions may further be characterized in terms of six (6) different classes of fiscal agency -- for the receipt of State and Federal funds -- and varying levels of authority to raise local revenues (e.g., taxing and bonding authority).

Tables II-6 and II-7 identify the general classes of governing authorities for vocational education institutions and delivery systems; Table II-8 identifies the characteristics of the fiscal status of these institutions and delivery systems.

Table II-9 describes the vocational education systems of each of the States and Territories in terms of the types of governing authorities and fiscal agency characteristics that apply to each type of institution and delivery system.

NOTE: In interpreting the tables, it should be noted that the complex nature of most State's vocational education systems virtually defies simple classification. Data provided in these tables are intended solely for use in the comparative study of State vocational education systems. Readers are advised to review in detail the descriptions of each State vocational education system contained in Volume II of this report.

Table II-1

Definitions of Institutional Types[1,2]

Institutional Type	Definition
Comprehensive High School	A comprehensive high school is a general high school offering programs in both vocational and general academic subjects, but in which the majority of the students are not enrolled in programs of vocational education.
Vocational High School	A vocational high school is a specialized secondary school that offers a full-time program of study in both academic and vocational subjects and in which all or a majority of the students are enrolled in vocational education programs.
Area Vocational Center	An area vocational center is a shared-time facility that provides instruction in vocational education only to students from throughout a school system or region. Students attending an area vocational center receive the academic portion of their education program in regular high school and other institution.
Community College	A community college is a two-year postsecondary degree granting institution offering a comprehensive program of instruction in both general and vocational-technical education and offering a transfer program to higher education institutions.
Technical Institute	A technical institution is a two-year postsecondary degree granting institution offering instruction primarily in vocational and technical education and whose educational programs are primarily directed toward immediate job placement -- although provisions may exist for the transfer of credit to institutions of higher education.
Area Vocational School	An area vocational school is a postsecondary non-degree granting institution (or an institution offering a degree that is not recognized as a collegiate degree by the appropriate regional accrediting commission) offering instruction in vocational and technical education only, and whose educational progrms are terminal in nature. Such institutions generally have no provision for the development of transfer programs to either two-year institutions or to four-year institutions of higher education.

[1]Though not part of the general definitions provided above, the universe of institutions for which data is reported in the study is limited to comprehensive high schools having shop, laboratory or classroom facilities for five or more different programs in vocational education.

[2]While many four-year colleges and universities also offer two-year programs in vocational-technical education, these institutions were excluded from this study unless they operated a designated area vocational education school.

Table II-2

Definitions of Vocational Education Delivery Systems and Program Organization Types[1]

Type of Delivery System or Program Organization	Definition
REGULAR[2] School District	A REGULAR school district is one in which a local education agency has responsibility for the administration of both general and vocational education programs in institutions other than those established by special purpose enabling legislation.
Subtype A	Regular elementary and secondary school district
Subtype B	Independent postsecondary technical institute or community college school district
SPECIAL[2] School District	A SPECIAL school district is an independent school district that exists apart from regular school districts serving the same region and that has an independent administrative authority and generally independent taxing and bonding authority.
Subtype A	An independent secondary vocational school district providing vocational education services only
Subtype B	An independent school secondary school district providing vocational education as well as other shared services
Subtype C	An independent postsecondary vocational education district
JOINT[2] Vocational Education Program	A JOINT vocational education program is a vocational education program offered in a separate institution that is supported jointly by two or more of the school systems served by the institution.
Subtype A	A vocational education institution jointly operated by participating school districts
Subtype B	Vocational education institution operated by an independent/quasi-independent authority and serving sponsoring member school districts
SHARED RESOURCE[2] Vocational Education Program	A SHARED RESOURCE vocational education program is a vocational education program serving students from multiple school districts through any of a variety of student exchange programs including contracts, joint agreements, etc. Vocational education programs involving the sharing of resources are generally administered independently by the participating educational systems.
HOST SCHOOL[2] Vocational Education Programs	A HOST SCHOOL vocational education program is a vocational education program administered by a regular school district but serving students throughout a region.
STATE[2] Vocational Education Programs	A STATE vocational education program is a vocational education program administered directly by a State agency or by a local authority under provisions established by a State agency.
Subtype A	State vocational high schools (full-time)
Subtype B	State postsecondary area vocational schools
Subtype C	State technical institutes
Subtype D	State community college systems

[1]This table defines classes of delivery systems only and should not be confused with types of administrative structures which are defined in Tables II-7 and II-8 and reported by State in Table II-9.

[2]Capitalized words are used as classifiers in Table II-4.

Table II-3

Types of Regional Service Arrangements

Regional Service System	Definition
REGULAR* School District	An institution serving a single regular school district is (for purposes of this study) a secondary school serving students from within a regular secondary or secondary and postsecondary school district only.
Regional School DISTRICT*	A regional school district administers an educational program whose client school systems are defined either by their inclusion in the boundaries of an independent district or by their membership in a jointly organized and supported educational system.
Regional Vocational Education PROGRAM*	A regional vocational education program is offered in a vocational education system serving students from more than one designated school district or within designated boundaries, but not existing as an independent educational authority. (This designation is generally applicable to "host" school programs, some joint vocational school and shared resource vocational education programs, and State institutions serving fixed regions.)
Vocational Education SERVICE AREA*	An institution serving a regional vocational education service area is an institution having primary responsibility for vocational education within a region whose boundaries are defined for administrative and planning purposes but which do not uniquely and wholly define the population to be served. (This designation generally applies only to State institutions.)

*Capitalized words are used as classifiers in Table II-4.

Table II-4

State Vocational Education Institutions, Regional Service Arrangements, and Delivery System/Program Organization Types

State	Institution	Institution Type[1]	Number	Delivery System/ Program Organization Type[2]	Regional Service Arrangement[3]
Alabama	Comprehensive High School	Comprehensive High School	15	REGULAR (A)	REGULAR
	Area Vocational Centers	Area Vocational Center	82	JOINT (A)	PROGRAM
	Tech. Colleges & Tech. Inst.	Technical Institute	20	STATE (B)	SERVICE AREA
	Junior Colleges	Community College	20	STATE (D)	SERVICE AREA
	Community Colleges	Community College	5	STATE (D)	SERVICE AREA
Alaska	Comprehensive High Schools	Comprehensive High School	2	REGULAR (A)	REGULAR
	Career Centers	Area Vocational Center	2	REGULAR (A)	PROGRAM
	Community Colleges	Community Colleges	10	STATE (D)	SERVICE AREA
Arizona	Comprehensive High Schools	Comprehensive High School	21	REGULAR (A)	REGULAR
	Community Colleges	Community College	9 [22*]	SPECIAL (C)	DISTRICT
Arkansas	Comprehensive High Schools	Comprehensive High School	34	REGULAR (A)	REGULAR
	Area High School Centers	Area Vocational Center	9	HOST	PROGRAM
	Area Vocational Schools	Area Vocational School	23	STATE (B)	SERVICE AREA
	Community Colleges	Community College	6	SPECIAL (C)	SERVICE AREA
California	Comprehensive High Schools	Comprehensive High School	(623)	REGULAR (A)	REGULAR
	Regional Occup. Centers	Area Vocational Center	9	SHARED RESOURCE	PROGRAM
	Community Colleges	Community College	70[104*]	REGULAR (B)	DISTRICT
Colorado	Comprehensive High Schools	Comprehensive High School	76	REGULAR (A)	REGULAR
	BOCES	Area Vocational School	3	SHARED RESOURCE	PROGRAM
	BOCES	Area Vocational School	4	REGULAR (A)	REGULAR
	State Community Colleges	Community College	7	STATE (D)	SERVICE AREA
	Local District Junior Col.	Community College	4	SPECIAL (C)	DISTRICT

[1]See Table II-1 for definitions.
[2]See Table II-2 for definitions.
[3]See Table II-3 for definitions.
( ) denote estimates where actual numbers could not be supplied by State agencies.
*Number of campuses for institutions is given in brackets.

DATA IN THIS TABLE SHOULD BE USED ONLY IN THE CONTEXT OF THE SUPPLEMENTARY NOTE PROVIDED ON PAGE 46.

Table II-4 (Continued)

State Vocational Education Institutions, Regional Service Arrangements, and Delivery System/Program Organization Types

State	Institution	Institution Type[1]	Number	Delivery System/ Program Organization Type[2]	Regional Service Arrangement[3]
Connecticut	Comprehensive High Schools	Comprehensive High School	35	REGULAR (A)	REGULAR
	Regional Voc-Tech Schools	Area Vocational Center	17	STATE (A)	SERVICE AREA
	Regional Voc-Ag. Centers	Area Vocational Center	15	STATE (A)	SERVICE AREA
	State Technical Colleges	Technical Institute	4	STATE (C)	SERVICE AREA
	Community Colleges	Community College	12	STATE (B)	SERVICE AREA
Delaware	Comprehensive High Schools	Comprehensive High School	(25)	REGULAR (A)	REGULAR
	Area Vocational Centers	Area Vocational Center	4	SPECIAL (B)	DISTRICT
	Technical & Community Colleges	Community College	4	SPECIAL (C)	SERVICE AREA
District of Columbia	Comprehensive High Schools	Comprehensive High School	11	REGULAR (A)	REGULAR
	Area Vocational High Schools	Vocational High School	6	SPECIAL (B)	DISTRICT
	Technical Institute	Technical Institute	1	STATE	DISTRICT
Florida	Comprehensive High Schools	Comprehensive High School	94	REGULAR (A)	REGULAR
	Area Voc-Tech Centers	Area Vocational Centers	32	SPECIAL (A)	SERVICE AREA
	Community Colleges	Community Colleges	28	STATE (B)	SERVICE AREA
Georgia	Comprehensive High Schools	Comprehensive High School	120	REGULAR (A)	REGULAR
	Area Vocational Centers	Area Vocational Center	9	REGULAR (A)	REGULAR
	Area Technical Schools	Area Vocational School	25	STATE (B)	SERVICE AREA
	Junior Colleges	Community College	3	STATE (D)	SERVICE AREA
Hawaii	Comprehensive High Schools	Comprehensive High School	(30)	REGULAR (A)	REGULAR
	Community Colleges	Community College	7	REGULAR (B)	REGULAR
Idaho	Comprehensive High Schools	Comprehensive High School	50	REGULAR (A)	REGULAR
	Area Voc-Tech Schools	Area Vocational School	6	STATE (B)	SERVICE AREA

[1]See Table II-1 for definitions.

[2]See Table II-2 for definitions.

[3]See Table II-3 for definitions.

( ) denote estimates where actual numbers could not be supplied by State agencies.

°Number of campuses for institutions is given in brackets.

DATA IN THIS TABLE SHOULD BE USED ONLY IN THE CONTEXT OF THE SUPPLEMENTARY NOTE PROVIDED ON PAGE 46.

Table II-4 (Continued)

State Vocational Education Institutions, Regional Service Arrangements, and Delivery System/Program Organization Types

State	Institution	Institution Type[1]	Number	Delivery System/ Program Organization Type[2]	Regional Service Arrangement[3]
Illinois	Comprehensive High Schools	Comprehensive High School	(600)	REGULAR (A)	REGULAR
	Area Vocational Centers	Area Vocational Center	30	REGULAR (A)/SPECIAL (A)	DISTRICT
	Community Colleges	Community College	39 [51*]	REGULAR (B)	DISTRICT
Indiana	Comprehensive High Schools	Comprehensive High School	86	REGULAR (A)	REGULAR
	Cooperative Area Programs	Area Vocational Center	38	HOST/SHARED	PROGRAM
	Voc-Tech College System	Technical Institute	13	STATE (C)	SERVICE AREA
Iowa	Comprehensive High Schools	Comprehensive High School	8	REGULAR (A)	REGULAR
	Merged Area Schools	Area Vocational School	15 [26*]	SPECIAL (C)	PROGRAM
Kansas	Comprehensive High Schools	Comprehensive High School	24	REGULAR (A)	REGULAR
	Area Voc-Tech Schools	Area Vocational Center	14	SPECIAL (C)	PROGRAM
	Community Junior Colleges	Community College	19	REGULAR (B)	DISTRICT
Kentucky	Voc. Dept. of Secondary Schools	Comprehensive High School	4	REGULAR (A)	REGULAR
	Area Voc. Ed. Centers	Area Vocational Center	68	STATE (A)	PROGRAM
	State Voc-Tech Schools	Area Vocational Schools	14	STATE (B)	PROGRAM
	Comm. College/Tech Inst.	Community College	13	STATE (D)	SERVICE AREA
Louisiana	Comprehensive High Schools	Comprehensive High School	24	REGULAR (A)	REGULAR
	Career Centers	Area Vocational Center	15	REGULAR (A)	REGULAR
	Postsec. Voc-Tech Institutions	Area Vocational School	43	STATE (B)	SERVICE AREA
	Community College	Community College	1	STATE (D)	SERVICE AREA
Maine	Vocational Centers	Area Vocational Centers	14	HOST/SHARED	PROGRAM
	Vocational Regions	Area Vocational Centers	11	HOST	REGION
	Satellite Centers	Comprehensive High School	22	REGULAR (A)	PROGRAM
	Voc-Tech Institutes	Technical Institute	6	STATE (C)	SERVICE AREA

[1]See Table II-1 for definitions.
[2]See Table II-2 for definitions.
[3]See Table II-3 for definitions.
( ) denote estimates where actual numbers could not be supplied by State agencies.
*Number of campuses for institutions is given in brackets.

DATA IN THIS TABLE SHOULD BE USED ONLY IN THE CONTEXT OF THE SUPPLEMENTARY NOTE PROVIDED ON PAGE 46.

Table II-4 (Continued)

State Vocational Education Institutions, Regional Service Arrangements, and Delivery System/Program Organization Types

State	Institution	Institution Type[1]	Number	Delivery System/ Program Organization Type[2]	Regional Service Arrangement[3]
Maryland	Comprehensive High Schools	Comprehensive High School	46	REGULAR (A)	REGULAR
	Vocational High Schools	Vocational High School	5	REGULAR (A)	REGULAR
	Area Vocational Centers	Area Vocational Center	21	REGULAR (A)	REGULAR
	Community Colleges	Community College	18	REGULAR (B)	REGULAR
Massachusetts	Comprehensive High Schools	Comprehensive High School	42	REGULAR (A)	REGULAR
	Vocational High Schools	Vocational High School	(21)	REGULAR (A)	REGULAR
	Regional Voc-Tech High Schools	Vocational High School	26	SPECIAL (A)	DISTRICT
	Community Colleges	Community College	15	STATE (D)	SERVICE AREA
Michigan	Comprehensive High Schools	Comprehensive High School	269	REGULAR (A)(SHARED)	REGULAR(PROGRAM)
	Area Vocational Centers	Area Vocational Center	42	SPECIAL (A)	DISTRICT
	Community Colleges	Community College	29 [34*]	REGULAR (B)	DISTRICT
Minnesota	Comprehensive High Schools	Comprehensive High School	28	REGULAR (A)	REGULAR
	Cooperative Centers	Area Vocational Center	60	JOINT (A)	PROGRAM
	Area Voc-Tech Institutes	Area Vocational School	33	REGULAR (A)	PROGRAM
	Community Colleges	Community College	17	STATE (D)	SERVICE AREA
Mississippi	Comprehensive High Schools	Comprehensive High School	(40)	REGULAR (A)	REGULAR
	Vocational Centers - Secondary	Area Vocational Center	62	HOST/SPECIAL (A)	PROGRAM
	Vocational Centers - Jr. Col.	Area Vocational School	28	REGULAR (B)	SERVICE AREA
Missouri	Comprehensive High Schools	Comprehensive High School	(200)	REGULAR (A)	REGULAR
	Area Vocational Centers	Area Vocational Center	53	HOST	SERVICE AREA
	Junior Colleges	Community College	13 [16*]	REGULAR (B)	DISTRICT

[1]See Table II-1 for definitions.

[2]See Table II-2 for definitions.

[3]See Table II-3 for definitions.

( ) denote estimates where actual numbers could not be supplied by State agencies.

*Number of campuses for institutions is given in brackets.

DATA IN THIS TABLE SHOULD BE USED ONLY IN THE CONTEXT OF THE SUPPLEMENTARY NOTE PROVIDED ON PAGE 46.

Table II-4 (Continued)

State Vocational Education Institutions, Regional Service Arrangements, and Delivery System/Program Organization Types

State	Institution	Institution Type[1]	Number	Delivery System/ Program Organization Type[2]	Regional Service Arrangement[3]
Montana	Comprehensive High Schools	Comprehensive High School	(15)	REGULAR (A)	REGULAR
	Voc-Tech Centers	Area Vocational School	5	SPECIAL (C)	SERVICE AREA
	Community Colleges	Community College	3	REGULAR (B)	DISTRICT
Nebraska	Comprehensive High Schools	Comprehensive High School	57	REGULAR (A)	REGULAR
	Technical Community Colleges	Technical Institute	14	SPECIAL (C)	DISTRICT
Nevada	Comprehensive High Schools	Comprehensive High School	22	REGULAR (A)	REGULAR
	Area Voc-Tech School	Area Vocational School	1	REGULAR (A)	SERVICE AREA
	Community Colleges	Community College	3	STATE (D)	SERVICE AREA
New Hampshire	Comprehensive High Schools	Comprehensive High School	7	REGULAR (A)	REGULAR
	Area Vocational Centers	Area Vocational Center	20	HOST/SHARED	DISTRICT
	Voc-Tech Col. & Tech. Inst.	Technical Institute	7	STATE (C)	SERVICE AREA
New Jersey	Comprehensive High Schools	Comprehensive High School	79	REGULAR (A)	REGULAR
	Area Voc-Tech Schools	Area Vocational Centers Vocational High Schools	11 [29*] 9 [17*]	SPECIAL (A)	DISTRICT
	High School - AVTS's	Vocational High School	20	REGULAR (A)	DISTRICT
	Community Colleges	Community College	16	REGULAR (B)	DISTRICT
New Mexico	Comprehensive High Schools	Comprehensive High School	25	REGULAR (A)	REGULAR
	Area Vocational Schools	Area Vocational School	2	REGULAR (A)	SERVICE AREA
	Community & Junior Colleges	Community College	6	REGULAR (B)	SERVICE AREA
New York	Comprehensive High Schools	Comprehensive High School	(375)	REGULAR (A)	REGULAR
	Vocational High Schools	Vocational High School	(31)	REGULAR (A)	REGULAR
	BOCES	Area Vocational Center	44 [72*]	SHARED	PROGRAM
	Community Colleges	Community College	39 [44*]	REGULAR (B)	DISTRICT
	Agricultural & Tech Colleges	Technical Institute	6	STATE (C)	SERVICE AREA

[1]See Table II-1 for definitions.
[2]See Table II-2 for definitions.
[3]See Table II-3 for definitions.
( ) denote estimates where actual numbers could not be supplied by State agencies.
*Number of campuses for institutions is given in brackets.

DATA IN THIS TABLE SHOULD BE USED ONLY IN THE CONTEXT OF THE SUPPLEMENTARY NOTE PROVIDED ON PAGE 46.

Table II-4 (Continued)

State Vocational Education Institutions, Regional Service Arrangements, and Delivery System/Program Organization Types

State	Institution	Institution Type[1]	Number	Delivery System/ Program Organization Type[2]	Regional Service Arrangement[3]
North Carolina	Comprehensive High School	Comprehensive High Schools	(245)	REGULAR (A)	REGULAR
	Shared-Time Centers	Area Vocational Center	6	REGULAR (A)	REGULAR
	Technical Institutes	Technical Institute	35	STATE (C)	SERVICE AREA
	Community Colleges	Community Colleges	22	STATE (D)	SERVICE AREA
North Dakota	Comprehensive High Schools	Comprehensive High School	13	REGULAR (A)	REGULAR
	Vocational Centers	Area Vocational Center	9	REGULAR (A)	DISTRICT/PROGRAM
	Junior Colleges	Community College	2	REGULAR (A)	SERVICE AREA
	Junior Colleges	Community College	3	STATE (D)	SERVICE AREA
Ohio	Comprehensive High Schools	Comprehensive High School	(200)	REGULAR (A)	REGULAR
	Joint Voc. School Districts	Vocational High Schools	49	JOINT (B)	DISTRICT
	Community Colleges	Community College	5	REGULAR (B)	DISTRICT
	Technical Colleges	Technical Institute	17	STATE (C)	DISTRICT
	General & Tech Colleges	Community College	3	STATE (D)	SERVICE AREA
Oklahoma	Comprehensive High Schools	Comprehensive High School	39	REGULAR (A)	REGULAR
	Area Voc-Tech Schools	Vocational High School	31	REGULAR (B)	DISTRICT
	Community & Junior Colleges	Community College	14	STATE (D)	SERVICE AREA
	Technical Institute	Technical Institute	3	STATE (C)	SERVICE AREA
Oregon	Comprehensive High Schools	Comprehensive High School	119	REGULAR (A)	REGULAR
	Community Colleges	Community College	13 [23*]	REGULAR (B)	DISTRICT

[1] See Table II-1 for definitions.
[2] See Table II-2 for definitions.
[3] See Table II-3 for definitions.
( ) denote estimates where actual numbers could not be supplied by State agencies.
*Number of campuses for institutions is given in brackets.

DATA IN THIS TABLE SHOULD BE USED ONLY IN THE CONTEXT OF THE SUPPLEMENTARY NOTE PROVIDED ON PAGE 46.

Table II-4 (Continued)

State Vocational Education Institutions, Regional Service Arrangements, and Delivery System/Program Organization Types

State	Institutice	Institution Type[1]	Number	Delivery System/ Program Organization Type[2]	Regional Service Arrangement[3]
Pennsylvania	Comprehensive High Schools	Comprehensive High School	(180)	REGULAR (A)	REGULAR
	Vocational High Schools	Vocational High School	18	REGULAR (A)	REGULAR
	Area Voc-Tech Schools	Area Vocational Center	79	JOINT (A)	PROGRAM
	Community Colleges	Community College	14 [17*]	SPECIAL (C)	DISTRICT
Rhode Island	Area Vocational Facilities	Area Vocational Center	8	HOST	PROGRAM
	State Voc. Ed. School	Area Vocational Center	1	STATE (A)	SERVICE AREA
	Junior College	Community College	1 [2*]	STATE (D)	SERVICE AREA
South Carolina	Comprehensive High Schools	Comprehensive High School	68	REGULAR (A)	REGULAR
	Area Vocational Centers	Area Vocational Center	55	JOINT (A)	DISTRICT
	Technical Colleges	Technical Institute	16 [18*]	SPECIAL (C)	PROGRAM
South Dakota	Comprehensive High Schools	Comprehensive High School	19	REGULAR (A)	REGULAR
	Multi-Dist. Voc. Centers	Area Vocational Center	6	JOINT (A)	PROGRAM
	Vocational-Technical Schools	Area Vocational Schools	5	SPECIAL (C)	PROGRAM
Tennessee	Comprehensive High Schools	Comprehensive High School	(130)	REGULAR (A)	REGULAR
	Vocational Centers	Area Vocational Center	50	SHARED RESOURCE	PROGRAM
	Area Voc-Tech Schools	Area Vocational School	30	STATE (B)	SERVICE AREA
	Technical Institutes	Technical Institute	4	STATE (C)	SERVICE AREA
	Community Colleges	Community College	10	STATE (D)	SERVICE AREA
Texas	Comprehensive High Schools	Comprehensive High School	(250)	REGULAR (A)	REGULAR
	Area Vocational Schools	Area Vocational Center	152	SPECIAL (A)	REGULAR
	Community (Junior) Colleges	Community College	47 [56*]	SPECIAL (C)	SERVICE AREA
	Texas State Tech. Institute	Technical Institute	1 [4*]	STATE (C)	SERVICE AREA

[1]See Table II-1 for definitions.
[2]See Table II-2 for definitions.
[3]See Table II-3 for definitions.
( ) denote estimates where actual numbers could not be supplied by State agencies.
*Number of campuses for institutions is given in brackets.

DATA IN THIS TABLE SHOULD BE USED ONLY IN THE CONTEXT OF THE SUPPLEMENTARY NOTE PROVIDED ON PAGE 46.

Table II-4 (Continued)

State Vocational Education Institutions, Regional Service Arrangements, and Delivery System/Program Organization Types

State	Institution	Institution Type[1]	Number	Delivery System/ Program Organization Type[2]	Regional Service Arrangement[3]
Utah	Comprehensive High Schools	Comprehensive High School	88	REGULAR (A)	REGULAR
	Area Vocational Centers	Area Vocational Center	3	REGULAR (A)	REGULAR
	Area Vocational Centers	Area Vocational Center	3	STATE (A)	PROGRAM
	Technical Colleges	Technical Institute	2	STATE (C)	PROGRAM
	Two-Year Colleges	Community College	3	STATE (D)	SERVICE AREA
Vermont	High School/Area Centers	Area Vocational Center	15	HOST	DISTRICT
	Technical College	Technical Institute	1	STATE (C)	SERVICE AREA
Virginia	Comprehensive High Schools	Comprehensive High School	106	REGULAR (A)	REGULAR
	Comprehensive High Schools	Area Vocational Center	59	HOST	PROGRAM
	Area Vocational Centers	Area Vocational Center	28	REGULAR (A)	REGULAR
	Joint Vocational Centers	Area Vocational Center	10	JOINT (A)	PROGRAM
	Community Colleges	Community College	33*	STATE (D)	SERVICE AREA
Washington	Comprehensive High Schools	Comprehensive High School	43	REGULAR (A)	REGULAR
	Area Voc-Tech Institutes	Technical Institutes	5	STATE (C)	SERVICE AREA
	Community Colleges	Community College	22 [27*]	SPECIAL (C)	DISTRICT
West Virginia	Comprehensive High Schools	Comprehensive High School	40	REGULAR (A)	REGULAR
	Area Vocational Centers	Area Vocational Center	33	REGULAR (A)	REGULAR
	Area Vocational Centers	Area Vocational Center	7	JOINT (A)	DISTRICT
	Community Colleges	Community College	3	STATE (D)	SERVICE AREA
Wisconsin	Comprehensive High Schools	Comprehensive High School	187	REGULAR (A)	REGULAR
	Vocational Centers	Area Vocational Center	2	REGULAR (A)	PROGRAM
	Voc-Tech & Adult Ed. Districts	Area Vocational School	34	SPECIAL (C)	DISTRICT

[1]See Table II-1 for definitions.
[2]See Table II-2 for definitions.
[3]See Table II-3 for definitions.
( ) denote estimates where actual numbers could not be supplied by State agencies.
*Number of campuses for institutions is given in brackets.

DATA IN THIS TABLE SHOULD BE USED ONLY IN THE CONTEXT OF THE SUPPLEMENTARY NOTE PROVIDED ON PAGE 46.

Table II-4 (Continued)

State Vocational Education Institutions, Regional Service Arrangements, and Delivery System/Program Organization Types

State	Institution	Institution Type[1]	Number	Delivery System/ Program Organization Type[2]	Regional Service Arrangement[3]
Wyoming	Comprehensive High Schools	Comprehensive High School	(20)	REGULAR (A)	REGULAR
	Community Colleges	Community College	7	SPECIAL (C)	SERVICE AREA
American Samoa	Comprehensive High Schools	Comprehensive High School	4	REGULAR (A)	REGULAR
	Vocational Skill Center	Area Vocational Center	1	SHARED RESOURCE	PROGRAM
	Community College	Community College	1	STATE (D)	DISTRICT
Guam	Voc-Tech High School	Vocational High School	1	STATE (A)	DISTRICT
	Community College	Community College	1	STATE (D)	SERVICE AREA
Puerto Rico	Comprehensive High Schools	Comprehensive High School	14	STATE (A)	REGULAR
	Postsec. Voc-Tech Schools	Area Vocational School	2	STATE (B)	SERVICE AREA
	Technical Institutes	Technical Institute	2	STATE (C)	SERVICE AREA
	Agricultural School	Area Vocational School	12	STATE (B)	SERVICE AREA
	Special Voc. Center	Area Vocational School	4	STATE (B)	SERVICE AREA
	Tool & Die Making School	Area Vocational School	1	STATE (B)	SERVICE AREA
Trust Territory	Comprehensive High School	Comprehensive High School	1	REGULAR (A)	REGULAR
	Occupational Center	Area Vocational School	1	STATE (B)	DISTRICT
	Nursing School	Area Vocational School	1	STATE (B)	DISTRICT
	Community College	Community College	1	STATE (D)	DISTRICT
Virgin Islands	Comprehensive High Schools	Comprehensive High School	3	STATE (A)	SERVICE AREA
	College of the Virgin Islands	Community College	1	STATE (D)	SERVICE AREA

[1]See Table II-1 for definitions.
[2]See Table II-2 for definitions.
[3]See Table II-3 for definitions.
( ) denote estimates where actual numbers could not be supplied by State agencies.
*Number of campuses for institutions is given in brackets.

DATA IN THIS TABLE SHOULD BE USED ONLY IN THE CONTEXT OF THE SUPPLEMENTARY NOTE PROVIDED ON PAGE 46.

Table II-5

Total Number of Vocational Education Institutions by Type and State[1,3,4]

State	Comprehensive High Schools	Vocational High Schools	Area Vocational Centers	Area/Vocational Schools	Technical Institutes	Community and Junior Colleges[2]	Total
Alabama	15		82		20	25	142
Alaska	2		2			10	14
Arizona	21					22	43
Arkansas	34		9	23		6	72
California	(623)		9			104	736
Colorado	76		7			11	94
Connecticut	35		32		4	12	83
Delaware	(25)		4			4	33
District of Columbia	11	6			1		18
Florida	94		32			28	154
Georgia	120		9	25		3	157
Hawaii	(30)					7	37
Idaho	50			6			56
Illinois	(600)		30			51	681
Indiana	86		38		13		137
Iowa	8			26			34
Kansas	24			14		19	57
Kentucky	4		68	14		13	99
Louisiana	24		15	43		1	83
Maine	22		25		6		53
Maryland	46	5	21			18	90
Massachusetts	42	47				15	104
Michigan	269		42			(34)	345
Minnesota	28		60	33		17	138
Mississippi	(40)		62	28		--	130
Missouri	(200)		53			16	269
Montana	(15)			5		3	23
Nebraska	57				14		71
Nevada	22			1		3	26
New Hampshire	7		20		7		34
New Jersey	79	37	29			16	161
New Mexico	25			2		6	33
New York	(375)	(31)	72		6	44	528
North Carolina	(245)		6		35	22	308
North Dakota	13		9			5	27
Ohio	(200)	49			17	5	272
Oklahoma	39	31			3	14	87
Oregon	119					23	142
Pennsylvania	(180)	18	79			17	294
Rhode Island			9			2	11
South Carolina	68		55		18		141
South Dakota	19		6	5			30
Tennessee	130		50	30	4	10	224
Texas	(250)		152		4	56	462
Utah	88		6		2	3	99
Vermont			15		1		16
Virginia	106		97			33	236
Washington	43				5	27	75
West Virginia	40		40			3	83
Wisconsin	187		2	34			223
Wyoming	(20)					7	27
American Samoa	4		1			1	6
Guam		1				1	2
Puerto Rico	14			19	2		35
Trust Territory	1			2		1	4
Virgin Islands	3					1	4
Total	4,878	225	1,248	310	162	720	7,543

[1]Does not include manpower skill centers, adult and other special schools, mobile facilities, or facilities in penal institutions.

[2]Multiple campuses counted individually.

[3]Numbers in parentheses indicate estimates used where exact numbers could not be derived.

[4]NOTE: Because of incomplete survey results, totals presented in this table do not match survey totals. Further, since some institutions, in responding to the mailed survey, classified themselves differently from classifications provided by State agencies, data in this table may be inconsistent with data presented in Chapters VI through IX.

Table II-6

Educational Agency Type

Classification	Description
State School System	State administered institutions having no direct participation of the "local" electorate in the selection of the administrative body.
State	School system administered by the State agency with no local governing board.
State-LB	State institution administered by a local governing board.
Independent School District	A legally constituted school district having locally selected administrative body empowered with the authority to enter into contracts and to raise taxes and issue bonds to raise capital and/or operating revenues.*
Ind-Reg	Regular school district (secondary).
Ind-Sp	Special school district (secondary) for shared services including, but not limited to vocational education.
Ind-Sp Voc	Special school district (secondary) exclusively responsible for vocational education.
Ind-PS	Independent community college district or other postsecondary education district.
JOINT School Program	An educational system serving multiple school districts and administered by an authority composed of representatives of participating school districts but not having independent legal status for taxation and bonding.
EXTERNAL Administrative Agency	An "independent" educational authority created by multiple school districts but operated as a quasi-independent authority under the direction of an agency representing the participating school districts.

*This definition also applies to school districts whose revenues must be raised by other authorities of local government -- such as county commissioners, etc. -- so long as such revenues are raised for the purpose of supporting the educational program(s) in the institution identified.

Table II-7

Composition of Governing Authority

Type	Description
Indep	Administrative authority (Board of Education or Board of Trustees, etc.) composed of lay citizens from the district served by the institution or educational program.
Rep-B	Administrative authority composed of one or more representatives of the Board of Education of the participating school district.
Rep-Ba	Administrative authority composed of representatives appointed by the Boards of Education of the participating school districts.
Rep-S	Administrative authority composed of the superintendents of the participating school districts.
State	Administrative authority appointed by the State.

Table II-8

Fiscal Agent Type

Model	Classification	Description
Dep	Fiscally Dependent Institution	The education agency does not receive State and Federal funds by direct appropriation to the institution but is supported by participating local education agencies with funds appropriated to them from State and Federal sources (and local revenues).
	Independent Fiscal Agent	The education agency receives direct appropriations of State and Federal funds.
		The educational institution is operated as a wholly independent fiscal agent.
	Local-D	Local revenues are secured through direct taxation and/or assessments.
	Local-I	Local revenues are secured through "tuition" paid by participating local education agencies.
	Local-P	One of the participating school districts is designated fiscal agent for the institution.
Mixed	Mixed Funding Status	Institutions which receive both direct allocation of State and Federal funds and support from participating local agencies which also receive supplementary State and Federal allocations.
State	State Fiscal Agent	The State education agency is the fiscal agent for the system. (Local agencies may be independent cost centers, but programs are fully funded with State and Federal funds.

Table II-9

Governing Authority Type and Composition, Fiscal Agent Type, and Authority of Local Vocational Education Systems

State	Institution and/or Program Type	Type of Local Authority[1]	Composition of Local Authority[2]	Fiscal Agent Type[3]	Fiscal Authority[4]
Alabama	Comprehensive High Schools	Ind-Reg	Indep	Local-D	T,B
	Area Vocational Centers	Ind-Reg	Rep-B/Rep-S	Mixed	N
	Technical Colleges and Institutes	State	State	State	N[5]
	Junior and Community Colleges	State	State	State	N[5]
Alaska	Comprehensive High Schools	Ind-Reg	Indep	Local-D	T,B
	Career Centers	Ind-Reg	Indep	Local-D	N
	Community Colleges	State	State	State	N
Arizona	Comprehensive High Schools	Ind-Reg	Indep	Local-D	T,B
	Community Colleges	Ind-Reg	Indep	Local D	T,B
Arkansas	Comprehensive High Schools	Ind-Reg	Indep	Local-D	T,B
	Area High School Centers	Ind-Reg	Indep	Mixed/Local-I	T,B
	Area Vocational Schools	State	State	State	N
	Community Colleges	Ind-PS	Indep	State/Local-D	T,B
California	Comprehensive High Schools	Ind-Reg	Indep	Local-D	T[5],B
	Regional Occupational Centers	Ind-Reg/Joint	Indep/Rep-B/Rep-S	Local-D	T
	Community Colleges	Ind-PS	State	Local-D	T,B
Colorado	Comprehensive High Schools and BOCES	Ind-Reg	Indep	Local-D	T,B
	Independent BOCES	Joint	Rep-B	Local-P	N
	State Community College	State	State	State	N
	Local District Junior Colleges	Ind-PS	State	Local-D	T,B
Connecticut	Comprehensive High Schools	Ind-Reg	Indep	Local-D	T,B
	Regional Vocational-Technical Schools	State	State	State	N
	Regional Vocational-Agriculture Centers	State-LB	Indep	Dep	N
	State Technical Colleges	State	State	State	N
	Community Colleges	State	State	State	N
Delaware	Comprehensive High Schools	Ind-Reg	Indep	Local-D	T
	Area Vocational Centers	Ind-Sp Voc	Indep	Local-D	T
	Technical and Community Colleges	State-LB	Indep	Local-D	N
District of Columbia	Comprehensive and Area Voc. High Schools	Ind-Reg	Indep	State[5]	T,B
Florida	Comprehensive High Schools	Ind-Reg	Indep	Local-D	T,B
	Area Vocational-Technical Centers	Joint	Indep	Local-D	T,B
	Community Colleges	State-LB	State	Mixed	N[5]
Georgia	Comprehensive High Schools	Ind-Reg	Indep	Local-D	T,B
	Area Vocational Centers	Ind-Reg	Indep	Local-D	T,B
	Area Technical Schools	State-LB	State	State	N
	Area Technical Schools	State	State	State	N
	Junior Colleges	State-LB	Indep	Local-D	T
Hawaii	Comprehensive High Schools	State	Indep	State	N
	Community Colleges	State-LB	State	State	N
Idaho	Comprehensive High Schools	Ind-Reg	Indep	Local-D	T,B
	Area Vocational-Technical Schools	State	State	State	N
	Area Voc-Tech Schools (under community colleges and universities)	State-LB	Indep	State	N
Illinois	Comprehensive High Schools	Ind-Reg	Indep	Local-D	T,B
	Area Vocational Centers	Ind-Spec	Rep-B	Local-I	N
	Area Vocational Centers	Joint	Rep-S/Rep-B	Local-I	N
	Community Colleges	Ind-PS	Indep	Local-D	T,B

[1] Refer to Table II-6.

[2] Refer to Table II-7.

[3] Refer to Table II-8.

[4] T = Local taxing authority; B = Local bonding authority.
N = No local taxing or bonding authority.

[5] See special provisions in State Reports, Volume II.

DNA: Data not available.

Table II-9 (Continued)

Governing Authority Type and Composition, Fiscal Agent Type, and Authority of Local Vocational Education Systems

State	Institution and/or Program Type	Type of Local Authority[1]	Composition of Local Authority[2]	Fiscal Agent Type[3]	Fiscal Authority[4]
Indiana	Comprehensive High Schools	Ind-Reg	Indep	Local-D	T,B
	Cooperative Area Programs	Ind-Sp Voc	Rep-B	Local-D	T[5]
	Area Vocational Program - Fiscal Agent	Ind-Sp Voc	Indep	Local-P/I	N
	Vocational-Technical College System	State	Indep	State	N
Iowa	Comprehensive High Schools	Ind-Reg	Indep	Local-D	T,B
	Merged Area Schools	Ind-PS	Indep	Local-D	T
Kansas	Comprehensive High Schools	Ind-Reg	Indep	Local-D	T,B
	Area Vocational-Technical Schools - Type I	Ind-Reg	Indep	Local-D	T,B
	Area Vocational-Technical Schools - Type II	Ind-Sp Voc	Rep-B	Mixed	N
	Community Junior Colleges	Ind-PS	Indep	Local-D	T,B
Kentucky	Vocational Departments of Secondary Schools	Ind-Reg	Indep	Local-D	T,B
	Area Vocational-Education Centers	State	State	State	N
	State Vocational-Technical Schools	State	State	State	N
	Community Colleges	State	State	State	N
Louisiana	Comprehensive High Schools	Ind-Reg	Indep	Local-D	T,B
	Career Centers	Ind-Reg	Indep	Local-D	T,B
	Postsecondary Voc-Tech Institutions	State	State	State	N
	Community College	State	State	State	N
Maine	Vocational Centers	Ind-Reg	Indep	Mixed/Local-I	T,B
	Vocational Regions	Joint	Rep-B	Mixed/Local-I	T[5],B
	Satellite Centers	Ind-Reg	Indep	Mixed/Local-I	T[5],B
	Vocational-Technical Institutes	State	State	State	N
Maryland	Comprehensive High Schools	Ind-Reg	Indep	Local-D	T,B
	Vocational High Schools	Ind-Reg	Indep	Local-D	T,B
	Area Vocational Centers	Ind-Reg	Indep	Local-D	T,B
	Community Colleges	Ind-PS	State/Indep	Local-D	T,B
Massachusetts	Comprehensive High Schools	Ind-Reg	Indep	Local-D	T,B
	Vocational High Schools	Ind-Reg	Indep	Local-D	T,B
	Regional Vocational-Technical High Schools	Ind-Sp Voc	Indep	Local-D	T,B
	Community Colleges	State	State	State	N
Michigan	Comprehensive High Schools	Ind-Reg	Indep	Local-D	T,B
	Area Vocational Centers	Ind-Sp	Rep-B/Indep	Local-D	T,B
	Community Colleges	Ind-PS	Indep	Local-D	T,B
Minnesota	Comprehensive High Schools	Ind-Reg	Indep	Local-D	T,B
	Cooperative Centers	Ind-Reg	Rep-B	Local-I	N
	Area Vocational-Technical Institutes	Ind-Reg	Indep/Rep-B	Local-D	T,B
	Community Colleges	State	State	State	N
Mississippi	Comprehensive High Schools	Ind-Reg	Indep	Local-D	T,B
	Vocational Centers - Secondary	Ind-Reg	Indep/Rep-B	Mixed	N
	Vocational Centers - Junior College	Ind-PS	Indep	Local-D	T,B
Missouri	Comprehensive High Schools	Ind-Reg	Indep	Local-D	T,B
	Area Vocational Centers	Ind-Reg	Indep	Local-D/I	T,B
	Junior Colleges	Ind-PS	Indep	Local-D	T,B
Montana	Comprehensive High Schools	Ind-Reg	Indep	Local-D	T,B
	Vocational-Technical Centers	Ind-Reg	Indep	Local-D	T,B
	Community Colleges	Ind-Reg	Indep	Local-D	T,B
Nebraska	Comprehensive High Schools	Ind-Reg	Indep	Local-D	T,B
	Technical Community Colleges	Ind-PS	Indep	Local-D	T

[1] Refer to Table II-6.

[2] Refer to Table II-7.

[3] Refer to Table II-8.

[4] T = Local taxing authority; B = Local bonding authority.
N = No local taxing or bonding authority.

[5] See special provisions in State Reports, Volume II.

DNA: Data not available.

Table II-9 (Continued)

Governing Authority Type and Composition, Fiscal Agent Type, and Authority of Local Vocational Education Systems

State	Institution and/or Program Type	Type of Local Authority[1]	Composition of Local Authority[2]	Fiscal Agent Type[3]	Fiscal Authority[4]
Nevada	Comprehensive High Schools	Ind-Reg	Indep	Local-D	T,B
	Area Vocational-Technical School	Ind-Reg	Indep	Local-D	T,B
	Community Colleges	State	State	State	N
New Hampshire	Comprehensive High Schools	Ind-Reg	Indep/Rep-B	Local-D	I,B
	Area Vocational Centers	Ind-Reg	Indep/Rep-B	Local-I	I
	Vocational-Technical Colleges	State	State	State	N
	Technical Institute	Ind-Sp	State	State	N
New Jersey	Comprehensive High Schools	Ind-Reg	Indep	Local-D	I,B
	Area Vocational-Technical Schools	Ind-Sp Voc	Indep	Local-D/I	T,B
	Community Colleges	State-LB	Ind	Local-D	I,B
New Mexico	Comprehensive High Schools	Ind-Reg	Indep	Local-D	I,B
	Area Vocational Schools	Ind-PS	Indep	Local-D	I,B
	Junior Colleges	Ind-PS	Indep	Local-D	I,B
	Community College	State-LB [4]	State	State	I,B
		Ind-PS	Indep	Local-I	I,B
New York	Comprehensive High Schools	Ind-Reg	Indep	Local-D	I,B
	Vocational High Schools	Ind-Reg	Indep	Local-D	I,B
	BOCES	Ind-Sp	Rep-B	Local-I	N
	Community Colleges	Ind-PS	Indep	Local-D	I,B
	Agricultural and Technical Colleges	State	State	State[5]	N
North Carolina	Comprehensive High Schools	Ind-Reg	Indep	Local-D	I,B
	Shared-Time Centers	Ind-Reg	Indep	Local-D	
	Community Colleges and Technical Institutes	State-LB	Indep	Local-D	I,B
North Dakota	Comprehensive High Schools	Ind-Reg	Indep	Local-D	I,B
	Vocational Centers	Ind-Sp Voc	Rep-B	Local-D	N
	Junior Colleges	State	State	State	I,B
	Junior Colleges	Ind-Reg	Indep	Local-D	I,B
Ohio	Comprehensive High Schools	Ind-Reg	Indep	Local-D	T,B
	Joint Vocational School Districts	Ind-Sp Voc	Indep/Rep-B	Local-D	T,B
	Community Colleges	Ind-PS	Indep	Local-D	T,B
	Technical Colleges	Ind-PS	Indep	State/Local-D	N
	General and Technical Colleges	State-LB	State	State	N
Oklahoma	Comprehensive High Schools	Ind-Reg	Indep	Local-D	T,B
	Area Vocational-Technical Schools	Ind-Sp Voc	Indep	Local-D	T,B
	Community and Junior Colleges	State-LB	Indep	State	N
	Tulsa Junior College	Ind-PS	Indep	Local-D	T,B
Oregon	Comprehensive High Schools	Ind-Reg	Indep	Local-D	I,B
	Community Colleges	Ind-PS	Indep	Local-D	T,B[5]
Pennsylvania	Comprehensive High Schools	Ind-Reg	Indep	Local-D	T,B
	Vocational High Schools	Ind-Reg	Indep	Local-D	T,B
	Area Vocational-Technical Schools	Ind-Sp	Rep-B	Dep	N
	Community Colleges	Ind-PS	Rep-B	Dep	N
Rhode Island	Area Vocational Facilities	Ind-Reg	Indep	Mixed/Local-P	N
	Area Vocational Facilities	State	State	State	N
	Junior College	State	State	State	N
South Carolina	Comprehensive High Schools	Ind-Reg	Indep	Local-D	T,B
	Area Vocational Centers	Ind/Sp Voc/Joint	Indep/Rep-B	Local-D or P	N
	Technical Colleges	Ind-PS	Indep	Local-D	T
South Dakota	Comprehensive High Schools	Ind-Reg	Indep	Local-D	I,B
	Multi-District Vocational Centers	Joint	Rep-B	Local-T or P	N
	Vocational-Technical Schools	State-LB	Indep	Local-P	N

[1] Refer to Table II-6.

[2] Refer to Table II-7.

[3] Refer to Table II-8.

[4] T = Local taxing authority; B = Local bonding authority.
N = No local taxing or bonding authority.

[5] See special provisions in State Reports, Volume II.

DNA: Data not available.

Table II-9 (Continued)

Governing Authority Type and Composition, Fiscal Agent Type, and Authority of Local Vocational Education Systems

State	Institution and/or Program Type	Type of Local Authority[1]	Composition of Local Authority[2]	Fiscal Agent Type[3]	Fiscal Authority[4]
Tennessee	Comprehensive High Schools	Ind-Reg	Indep	Local-D	T,B
	Vocational Centers	State-LB	Rep-B	Local-P	N
	Area Vocational-Technical Schools	State	State	State	N
	Technical Institutes and Community Colleges	State	State	State	N
Texas	Comprehensive High Schools	Ind-Reg	Indep	Local-D	T,B
	Area Vocational Schools	Ind-Sp Voc	Indep	Local-P	T,B
	Community (Junior) Colleges	Ind-PS	Indep	Local-D(44)	T,B
	Community Colleges	Ind-Reg	Indep	Local-P(3)	N
	Texas State Technical Institute	State-LB	State	State	N
Utah	Comprehensive High Schools	Ind-Reg	Indep	Local-D	T,B
	Area Vocational Centers	State-LB	Rep-B	State	N
	Technical Colleges	State	State	State	N
	Two-Year Colleges	State	State	State	N
Vermont	High School/Area Vocational Centers	Ind-Reg	Indep	Local-P/I	T,B
	Technical College	State	State	State	N
Virginia	Comprehensive High Schools	Ind-Reg	Indep	Local-D	T,B
	Area Vocational Centers	Ind-Reg	Indep	Local D	TB
	Joint Vocational Centers	Joint	Rep-B	Local-P	N
	Community Colleges	State	State	State	
Washington	Comprehensive High Schools	Ind-Reg	Indep	Local-D	T,B
	Area Vocational-Technical Institutes	Ind-Sp Voc	Indep	Local-D	T,B
	Community Colleges	Ind-PS	State	Local-D	N
West Virginia	Comprehensive High Schools	Ind-Reg	Indep	Local-D	T,B
	Area Vocational Centers	Ind-Reg	Indep	Local-D	T,B
	Area Vocational Centers	Ind-Sp Voc	Rep-B	Local-P/I	N
	Community Colleges	State	State	State	N
Wisconsin	Comprehensive High Schools	Ind-Reg	Indep	Local-D	T,B
	Vocational Centers	Lad-Sp	Rep-S	Local-S/I	T,B
	Voc-Tech and Adult Education Districts	Ind-PS	Indep	Local-D	T,B
Wyoming	Comprehensive High Schools	Ind-Reg	Indep	Local-D	T,B
	Community Colleges	Ind-PS	Indep	Local-D	T,B
American Samoa	Comprehensive High Schools	State	Indep	State	N
	Skill Center	State	Indep	State	N
	Community College	Ind-Sp Voc	State	State	N
Guam	Voc-Tech. High School	State	State	State	N
	Community College	State-LB	State	State	N
Puerto Rico	Comprehensive High Schools	State	State	State	N
	Postsecondary Vocational-Technical Schools	State	State	State	N
	Technical Institutes	State	State	State	N
	Special Schools	State	State	State	N
Trust Territory	Comprehensive High School	State	Indep	State	N
	Occupational Center	State	State	State	N
	Nursing School	State-LB	State	State	N
	Community College	State-LB	State	State	N
Virgin Islands	Comprehensive High Schools	State	Indep	State	N
	College of Virgin Islands	State	State	State	N

[1] Refer to Table II-6.

[2] Refer to Table II-7.

[3] Refer to Table II-8.

[4] T = Local taxing authority; B = Local bonding authority.
N = No local taxing or bonding authority.

[5] See special provisions in State Reports, Volume II.

DNA: Data not available.

CHAPTER III

OVERVIEW OF FACTORS AFFECTING STATE POLICIES FOR THE FINANCING OF VOCATIONAL EDUCATION

Prior to the enactment of the Vocational Education Act of 1963, congressional testimony suggested that a program of Federal support for the construction of facilities and acquisition of equipment for vocational education was required to promote the expansion of vocational education at the secondary and postsecondary levels.

When the Vocational Education Act of 1963 was enacted, few States had either the enabling legislation or the commitment to vocational education to engage in the facility expansion programs needed to meet the demand for vocational education. Therefore, the availability of Federal funds for constructing and equipping vocational education facilities represented a major -- and sometimes the only -- source of funds for use in expanding the facilities.

Following the passage of the Vocational Education Act of 1963, most States undertook major programs of new facilities construction which relied heavily on funds from this Act. The impact of the Vocational Education Act of 1963 on the expansion of facilities cannot, however, be measured solely in terms of the direct expenditure of Federal funds on facilities and equipment because many States adopted strategies for the use of these funds which promoted construction without the direct use of Federal funds.

The use of Federal funds for construction also had a secondary effect on the expansion of State vocational education systems. Changes were produced in State legislation and policy relating to the funding of both facility and equipment investments and the support of vocational education program operating costs.

The diversity and complexity of factors affecting the development of vocational education funding systems make it virtually impossible to identify specific characteristics which account for the differences in the expenditure of Vocational Education Act funds for facilities and equipment in each State. The following topics are intended to identify some of the factors that appear to have had a significant impact on the patterns of vocational education funding.

Since a detailed analysis of the roles of Federal and State funds in the expansion of vocational education facility resources was not a specific objective of this study, comparative data are not available for all States. Therefore, the following discussions are presented, and should be treated, as general impressions offered by the respondents and interpreted by the author.

Present and historical patterns of Federal vocational education expenditures are, and have been, defined largely in terms of legislation and policy relating to the use of State funds for general and vocational education.

Therefore, an analysis of patterns of expenditures of Vocational Education Act funds requires an understanding of the historical development of State educational finance practices and their effect on vocational education funding policy. Specifically, this requires an understanding of the following three factors:

- The association between general and vocational education funding provisions at the State level.
- The impact which Vocational Education Act [funds] expenditures -- especially construction investments -- have had on the State funding policy.
- The relationship that exists between policies for the expenditure of State and Federal funds for (a) facilities and equipment and (b) the operation of vocational education programs.

The Association Between Funding Policies for General and Vocational Education

One of the initial objectives of this study was to assess the impact of different vocational education funding policies on the effective utilization of vocational education facilities and fiscal resources. However, an examination of the diverse funding patterns which States have implemented for vocational education suggests that the legislative and policy provisions which govern vocational education funding are largely defined in terms of variables that are independent of the delivery systems employed within each State. Further, it has become apparent that the legislation and policy governing the organization and financing of vocational education is dictated more by the provisions of State legislation relating to general education than by the requirements of the vocational education systems, per se. That is, the patterns of State support for vocational education programs have not, generally, been developed to meet the specific needs of the emerging vocational educational systems and are not reflective of the requirements of these systems as an independent component of the total educational program.

While provisions for the funding of vocational education -- both facilities construction and program operation -- now differ substantially from those which apply to general education, the present systems of vocational education funding have resulted from a continuing series of incremental changes -- each of which represents an alteration of prior practices. Such changes have been made in the context of an evolving system in which refinements are made to current conditions that are themselves the product of prior practices, policies, and legislation whose roots are in general education. Even the funding provisions developed for vocational education delivery systems have generally been developed within constraints represented

by funding provisions which had been developed for totally different educational systems. As a consequence, few, if any, States can say that their present funding and delivery system for vocational education is the system that would have been implemented had it been possible to develop a vocational education funding program independent of the prior provisions and practices that existed for general education. The most significant conclusions that can be drawn from this observation are that: (a) policies developed for the expenditure of State and Federal vocational education funds may have been constrained by statutes and policies established for the expenditure of general education funds; and/or (b) policies for the expenditures of State and Federal vocational education funds are sub-optimal because their role in the finance system within which they are expended is determined by the policies developed for general education finance.

Impact of Vocational Education Act Funding Provisions on State Funding Policies

In many States, the success of vocational education programs offered in the institutions constructed with funds from the Vocational Education Act readily demonstrated that a significant need existed for vocational education programs. This demonstration of need led many States to enact legislation which expanded State support for vocational education programs and which made increased State funds available for the construction and equipping of vocational schools. In some States, these new funds were used primarily to support the expansion of area vocational schools while, in others, State funds were made available for the expansion of the vocational education facilities in comprehensive high schools and other institutions.

The increased availability of State funds for the support of vocational education facilities construction and equipment acquisition programs brought about the following three changes in the structure of vocational education systems and patterns of expenditure of funds from facilities construction and acquisition:

- First, the increased availability of State funds for capital expenses made possible a reduction in the expenditure of Vocational Education Act funds for facilities and equipment and permitted State agencies to expand the use of Vocational Education Act funds in supporting other aspects of their vocational education programs.

- Second, the availability of State funds for vocational education facilities accelerated the development of vocational education programs and brought about a significant expansion of vocational education programs in institutions other than area vocational schools.

- Third, the availability of vocational education funds from State sources provided an additional source of funds that could be used to match Federal construction dollars, and thus, further increase the rate and expansion of vocational education facilities resources.

Specific provisions for the use of State funds for facilities construction and equipment acquisition took different forms in different States. However, the overall trend was generally towards greater State involvement in the expansion of vocational education facility resources.

The expansion of vocational education facility resources resulting from the investments of funds from the Vocational Education Act and increased State funding of facilities for vocational education also had a significant impact on the manner in which vocational education funds were expended. The most immediate effect of the expansion of vocational education facilities is found in the fact that the increased number of programs offered in new and expanded facilities carried with it the requirement to provide increased resources to pay the operating costs of these programs. However, the rate of increase in demands for operating revenues was rarely paralleled by proportional increases in the support for vocational education at the State level -- either with special State funds for vocational education or with increases in general education funds to support the increased operating costs associated with vocational education programs. This limitation on the availability of State funds for program operation resulted in the expenditure of Vocational Education Act funds, which might have otherwise been used for construction or the general improvement of vocational education programs, for the support of vocational education operating costs. This action significantly reduced the amount of money available to support new construction projects and resulted in a decline in the use of Vocational Education Act funds for facility expansion. While the use of Vocational Education Act funds to support the maintenance of newly created vocational education programs has been criticized in several reports, it was probably inevitable that these funds would have a major role in the support of the operating costs until the States could increase their support for vocational education.

Two other factors have had a significant impact on the use of Vocational Education Act funds for construction. First, the Vocational Education Act Amendments of 1968 replaced the construction stimulus of the 1963 Act that made construction an allowable, but not specifically encouraged expenditure. This change came at a time when: (a) most States were in the middle of their expansion programs, and (b) a major demand was being placed on Vocational Education Act funds to provide support for programs established by the construction programs initiated in response to the prior legislation. Available data relating to construction trends is inconsistent, and it is impossible to ascertain the specific impact of this change in Federal legislation. Data compiled in this study suggests that facility construction and expansion projects have been undertaken at the same (or a higher) rate since the Vocational Education Amendments of 1968 as before. However, reports supplied by the States to the Office of Education -- which generally report only projects

using Federal funds -- do suggest a significant decline in both the number of projects undertaken with funds from the Vocational Education Act and in the portion of construction project costs funded from the Vocational Education Act.

Second, as the number of construction projects in a State increased and the Federal dollar became stretched to the point where only nominal support could be provided to individual projects from Federal funds, Federal funds no longer had the "driving force" they had when they represented a major portion of the project cost. Therefore, many States chose to terminate the use of Vocational Education Act funds for construction projects and diverted these funds to other purposes. (For this same reason, many of the States that receive very small allocations of Vocational Education Act funds have never used Federal funds for construction because they never received sufficient allocations of these funds to have a significant impact on their facility expansion programs.)

Relationship Between Provisions for Funding Vocational Education Facilities Construction and Program Operations

Policies for the funding of facilities construction and vocational education program operations differ substantially between States. Significant differences in construction and equipment funding provisions also apply to different institutions within States.

As previously noted, changes in funding policies make it virtually impossible to assess the impact of specific policies. However, discussions with State Directors of Vocational Education and others have identified some of the conditions which had an impact on the development of alternative funding strategies. While this information is insufficient to provide an adequate basis for addressing the question "What factors account for differences of facilities investments (of VEA funds) by the States?", it does provide a basis for understanding the impact which existing legislation has had on the patterns of vocational education expenditure. The following discussion is intended to provide some insight into the impact which existing policies relating to the funding of facilities construction and/or program operation have had on the expenditure of vocational education funds by individual States. The majority of the States from which the following examples have been drawn have changed one or more of their policies relating to facilities construction and program operation. However, these examples clearly demonstrate that policies relating to vocational facilities construction and program operations cannot be formulated (or assessed) independently; nor can they be studied independently of State policies for program support.

First, in at least some of the States where State legislation defines the State's participation in the support of program operating costs in

terms of a fixed formula percent of the total program cost, it has been the policy of the State agency for vocational education to commit a major portion of its Vocational Education Act funds to construction projects. This expansion of programs through construction "forces" an increase in State operating revenues for vocational education.

Second, policies of providing large amounts of construction funds from Federal sources have been used as incentives for local investments by enabling local agencies to, in effect, buy facilities and equipment for as little as 50 cents "on the local dollar" (i.e., 50:50 local:Federal match).

Third, where State participation in construction projects is mandated by law -- and especially where State law requires the State to fund the fixed percentage of the construction project -- the commitment of Vocational Education Act funds to construction and equipment acquisition projects has been used to "force" increased State investments in vocational school facility projects.

A corollary to the above situation is found in States in which there was no provision for State participation in school construction and/or where State participation in program operating costs was not established by legislation. In these States, Vocational Education Act funds cannot be used to force State and/or local investment in facilities or program operations. State agencies in these States have adopted one of two major alternative investment strategies.

The first alternative has been to encourage the expansion of facilities with local funds by promising Vocational Education Act funds to support operating costs of such programs. In States whose Vocational Education Act entitlements are so small as to make the use of these funds for construction meaningless, the policy of using Vocational Education Act funds for the support of program funds has been cited as the only viable means of promoting facility construction and expansion. However, in States where Vocational Education Act entitlements are sufficient to make alternative investment strategies viable, the operating cost support "carrot" strategy has been adopted simply as the most effective strategy for expanding facilities.

Other States have adopted a policy of using Vocational Education Act funds for facility expansion even though they recognized that such a policy would lead to an increased demand for operating revenue whose availability was not assured. Such policies have been undertaken either in anticipation of increased State support for program operations or with the recognition that such a policy would ultimately result in an increase in the share of the operating cost which must be borne by Vocational Eduction Act funds. Many of the States that initially committed a significant portion of their Vocational Education Act funds to construction are now in the position of having to support operating costs with these funds because other operating revenue sources have not expanded rapidly enough to maintain the programs established as a result of prior commitments of Vocational Education Act funds to construction projects.

Recognizing the potential for increased reliance on Vocational Education Act funds to maintain programs in the facilities initially built with funds from the Act, some States have developed investment and program support strategies which make the on-going operation of their vocational education systems independent of Federal support. That is, because they have found little assurance that Federal funds will be continued, they have sought to develop an overall funding system which is not dependent on Vocational Education Act funds for its continuity. The use of Vocational Education Act funds in these States is generally categorized by (a) investment in the expansion of facilities only at the rate at which State funds can be increased to fund the non-local share of the operating cost and (b) the use of Vocational Education Act funds for special projects and programs only. These actions free the system from a reliance on Vocational Education Act funds for on-going program support which, if terminated, would increase the local burden for operating cost.

CHAPTER IV

FINANCING FACILITIES AND EQUIPMENT FOR VOCATIONAL EDUCATION

A review of the information relating to the funding of vocational education facilities and capital equipment suggests the following major conclusions:

- It is not possible to determine the direct impact that the availability of Vocational Education Act funds has had on the total expansion of vocational education facility resources.

- It is not possible to assess the impact that alternative means of distributing funds for facilities have had on the development of the vocational education systems of each State.

- It is not feasible to determine the total amount of Vocational Education Act funds that have been expended on facilities and capital equipment.

These conclusions are based on two factors: the existence of major changes that have taken place in State funding policies and practices since 1963; and the general absence of adequate "audit trail" records that would provide a basis for documenting and assessing the impact (particularly the cost-effectiveness) of alternative capital investment policies and procedures. The significance of these two factors is discussed in the following topics.

Changes in Funding Policies and Practices

An evaluation of historical capital expenditure programs for vocational education must be undertaken in two parts:

- An analysis of expenditures made between 1964 and 1968 -- the first and last years in which the construction investment policies of States were dictated by the "construction promoting" provision of the 1963 Act.

- An analysis of expenditure patterns from 1969 to the present, during which time States had the flexibility to develop capital expenditure policies that reflected their individual needs.

Table IV-1 summarizes the percentage of reported vocational education facility construction costs paid by each State from the Vocational Education Act funds for each year from 1964 through 1975. As shown in this Table all but seven of the 54 States and Territories reported[1] the regular use of Vocational Education Act funds for construction with an average match of 42 percent. Most States that reported the use of Vocational Education Act funds during the period from 1964 through 1968 matched State and/or local investments on a 50:50 basis.

From 1969 to the present, however, the Federal share of reported construction projects declined significantly. During this period only 29 States and Territories regularly reported using Vocational Education Act funds for construction. For these States the average match was only 26 percent. These data clearly reflect the changes in funding policies resulting from changes in the Vocational Education Act brought about by the Amendments of 1968.

While this observation is significant in assessing the impact of Federal funds on facility resource expansion, an interpretation of these findings is obscured by changes in State capital project funding policy and other external variables on capital expenditures. Among the most significant of these changes are:

- Changes in State Agency organization -- some of which are reported in Table I-11 of Chapter I -- that have moved some of the institutions formerly under the State Agency for Vocational Education to another agency and, in the course of so doing, have changed their status of fundability.

- Changes in State legislation affecting the availability of State funds for expenses formerly supported with Federal funds.

- Increased voter rejection of bond issues for the local share of capital projects -- therefore negating the projects and precluding the investment of Federal funds.

In addition, State Agency respondents suggest that some Federal funds were initially expended on facilities, not because the State needed to use Federal funds in this manner, but because the legislation "required" that Federal funds be used for facilities. Hence, when the Federal law changed, State policy also changed.

While some of these changes are quantifiable, the relative impact of each of these changes is not readily apparent; nor is it possible to determine when and/or precisely how the impact of each was felt.

---

[1] No data were available for American Samoa and the Trust Territory for the years 1965-69.

Table IV-1

Reported Percentage of Construction Project Cost Financed with Vocational Education Act Funds

State	1965	1966	1967	1968	1969	1970	1971	1972	1973	1974	1975
Alabama	50	50	50	50	50	b	38	31	5	36	30
Alaska	0	0	0	0	0	b	8	0	0	0	0
Arizona	0	0	0	0	0	b	8	17	0	0	0
Arkansas	50	50	50	0	0	b	8	14	0	0	0
California	25	42	29	26	22	b	8	0	0	0	0
Colorado	50	50	50	50	50	b	26	38	10	50	36
Connecticut	0	0	0	0	0	b	0	0	0	0	0
Delaware	0	50	42	29	22	b	0	0	0	0	0
District of Columbia	50	50	36	30	27	b	0	0	0	0	0
Florida	49	30	36	44	41	b	31	27	25	30	33
Georgia	50	50	50	50	50	b	32	18	3	0	79
Hawaii	50	50	50	50	0	b	0	0	0	0	0
Idaho	12	45	42	0	0	b	0	0	0	0	0
Illinois	0	50	23	50	50	b	48	25	0	0	0
Indiana	50	50	50	50	27	b	23	23	42	13	12
Iowa	0	0	0	0	0	b	0	0	0	0	0
Kansas	50	50	43	46	48	b	0	0	0	0	0
Kentucky	50	36	50	49	41	b	34	33	36	15	0
Louisiana	0	0	50	0	0	b	0	0	0	0	0
Maine	0	50	0	36	50	b	0	0	3	0	0
Maryland	24	71	32	36	42	b	0	0	0	0	0
Massachusetts	33	80	21	20	11	b	12	9	4	7	3
Michigan	50	70	48	39	34	b	40	52	50	30	50
Minnesota	17	59	40	49	48	b	50	50	50	100	25
Mississippi	32	58	47	47	45	b	48	49	46	1	23
Missouri	50	65	37	43	37	b	53	38	23	8	38
Montana	0	50	50	44	50	b	0	0	0	0	0
Nebraska	50	50	50	0	0	b	0	0	0	0	0
Nevada	47	1	2	0	0	b	0	0	0	0	0
New Hampshire	20	16	48	40	7	b	23	0	0	0	0
New Jersey	34	31	34	34	25	b	28	28	24	20	26
New Mexico	50	41	47	48	0	b	0	0	0	0	0
New York	0	53	32	23	11	b	38	25	15	13	100
North Carolina	46	41	14	16	27	b	36	15	10	0	0
North Dakota	50	0	50	50	0	b	0	0	0	0	0
Ohio	50	47	50	50	50	b	6	26	48	23	17
Oklahoma	50	41	42	48	35	b	4	17	10	0	3
Oregon	50	30	24	39	10	b	0	0	0	0	0
Pennsylvania	27	27	19	13	13	b	9	13	7	0	14
Rhode Island	41	26	46	46	49	b	0	7	12	0	0
South Carolina	44	50	48	50	33	b	37	42	12	11	1
South Dakota	50	50	50	50	50	b	0	0	0	0	50
Tennessee	49	47	50	50	44	b	0	2	0	0	0
Texas	50	43	50	50	50	b	51	58	56	49	0
Utah	17	19	43	0	19	b	30	18	21	6	14
Vermont	46	48	48	7	10	b	0	0	0	0	0
Virginia	50	39	50	35	4	b	41	41	34	23	48
Washington	0	50	50	50	34	b	0	32	39	0	0
West Virginia	50	45	48	28	28	b	41	41	26	27	27
Wisconsin	40	46	47	50	40	b	12	15	14	7	24
Wyoming	0	37	50	0	0	b	0	0	0	7	0
American Samoa	a	a	a	a	a	b	0	0	0	0	0
Guam	0	0	45	50	30	b	0	0	0	0	0
Puerto Rico	50	50	49	0	41	b	95	50	30	0	0
Trust Territory	a	a	a	a	a	b	0	0	0	0	0
Virgin Islands	0	0	50	32	0	b	0	0	0	0	0

Source: Annual Report summaries compiled by the Bureau of Occupational and Adult Education, U.S. Office of Education.

a) Data not reported.

b) Summary report not available for 1970.

One should also note that the differences in the "match ratios" for the periods 1965-1969 and 1970-1976 may be affected by different types of institutions that may have been funded during these two time periods. Differences in matching provisions that have been applied to different types of institutions account, at least in part, for the differences reflected in fund distribution patterns depicted in Table IV-1. However, limitations on information relating to the specific provisions of historical funding programs prevent a complete assessment of the validity of this hypothesis.

Limitations of Available Records

Since the enactment of the Vocational Education Act of 1963, most States have made many changes in their definitions of fundable capital costs which qualify for support with Federal funds and the manner in which capital funds are distributed.

While it is possible to determine how much of a local education agency's allocation is now earmarked for different classes of expenses, it has not been possible to determine the portion of these expenses that have been funded from different budgets in the past. Furthermore, it generally has not been possible to determine whether funds have actually been expended for their intended purposes; or what percentage of the total costs were represented by the funds allocated from different budgets.

Changes in funding programs also result in misleading comparisons of program costs since different expense items are included in the allocation computations used in each State.

The problem of tracking capital expenditures is further complicated by the different funding procedures that frequently apply to different types of institutions. For instance, one construction cost support provision may apply to a comprehensive high school and a different rate to an area vocational school. Further, the same item may be funded differently under different circumstances. For instance, capital equipment acquired for a new facility may be funded as an integral component of the construction/equipment acquisition project under the provisions for new construction funding -- often without a distinction made between facility and equipment cost -- while the acquisition of the same equipment as a replacement item or for a new program in a renovated facility is funded under different provisions.

Available records generally identify the amount of allocations, but do not report, for individual expenditures, the provisions under which the allocation amounts were determined. This void prevents a meaningful evaluation of the impact of total program support procedures.

Several States have also provided Federal funds to capital projects on a reimbursement basis that represents a commitment of future funds, generally subject to the availability of funds. While this practice is no longer

used according to State Agency respondents, several States are continuing to pay off prior commitments. Such practices complicate any effort to correlate total expenditures to projects undertaken in a given fiscal year.

An assessment of the impact of Federal and State capital expenditures -- and the policies governing such expenditures -- requires an identification of the objectives sought in the formulation of such policies. However, neither the literature review conducted in the formulation of this study nor the interviews conducted with State Agency personnel revealed any definitive objectives for the policies identified. Rather, as indicated in the discussion in the previous chapter, funding policies are, and have been, primarily determined by the provisions of Federal and State legislation. While Agency policy and priorities may be shown to have a significant impact on specific aspects of capital funding provisions, little evidence exists to suggest that State Agencies can effectively establish long range provisions for capital expenditures. Rather, such plans are, for the most part, the product of legislative action and Board policy and are beyond the control of the State Agency administrator.

Facility and Equipment Funding Procedures

Although the limitations cited previously preclude an evaluation of the impact of Federal funds on construction and equipment acquisition, the data assembled in this study provide significant new information relating to the methods by which States distribute funds for construction and equipment acquisition.

Table IV-2 describes the basic characteristics of the alternative facility and equipment funding programs. Tables IV-3 and IV-4 describe the current funds sources and provisions applicable to the use of capital funds for construction and equipment in the 56 States and Territories.

NOTE: In interpreting these tables it should be noted that the complex nature of most States' vocational education program funding systems virtually defies simple classification. General provisions which apply to the use of State and Federal funds often differ for similar institutions, or may be applied in multiple combinations. Data provided in these tables are intended solely for use in the comparative study of different funding provisions as they are most commonly applied. Since this study was not inherently concerned with describing State vocational education funding systems, no attempt was made to fully document systems identified by respondents as "highly complex," "variable" or otherwise difficult to capsulize meaningfully with clarity. In many instances, these provisions make it impossible to clearly describe specific funding provisions or estimate the portion of tne total program cost in each institution provided by funds from different sources. Readers are, therefore, advised to review in detail the program descriptions of each State (contained in Volume II of this report) for detailed descriptions of each State's funding system.

It is also important to note that data provided by respondents interviewed in this study are not wholly consistent with data collected by the Federal (BOAE) reporting system. While in some instances substantial differences exist in these two data sources, the limited time and resources available to the study precluded an examination of these discrepancies.

Table IV-2

Procedures for Determining Capital Funds Allocations

Characteristic	Description
FIXED Percentage Funding	The percentage of the construction cost paid from each source is defined by either legislation or agency policy.
VARIABLE Percentage Funding	The percentage of the construction cost paid from each source is computed by formula.
UNIT Appropriation Funding	The amount of funds to be provided to a project from each funding source is defined in terms of a fixed allocation per student, per program, or per project.
PROJECT Appropriation Funding	Funds for each project are appropriated on a project-by-project basis -- either as special grants from the administering agency or through special legislative appropriations.
SPECIAL Funding	Special provisions that reflect complex unique policies not describeable in terms of the four basic procedures described above. (Special funding provisions are described in the reports on individual State vocational education systems.)
DIFFERENTIAL (Funding)	The amount of the total cost borne by sources indicated as "Differential" is the difference between the total cost and the amount provided from other sources based on the provision of other funding practices described above.

Table IV-3

Capital Funding Sources[1]

State	Institution	Construction Funding			Equipment Funding		
		Federal (VEA)	State	Local	Federal (VEA)	State	Local
Alabama	Comprehensive High Schools	O	X	X	O	X	X
	Area Vocational Centers	O	X	X	O	X	X
	Technical Colleges and Institutes	O	X		O	X	
	Junior and Community Colleges	O	X		O	X	
Alaska	Comprehensive High Schools		X	X		X	X
	Career Centers		X	X		X	X
	Community Colleges		X			X	
Arizona	Comprehensive High Schools			X	X	X	X
	Community Colleges		X	X		X	
Arkansas	Comprehensive High Schools			X		X	X
	Area High School Centers		X	X		X	X
	Area Vocational Schools		X			X	
	Community Colleges	X		X		X	X
California	Comprehensive High Schools		X	X	X	X	X
	Regional Occupational Centers		X	X	X	X	X
	Community Colleges		X	X	X	X	X
Colorado	Comprehensive High Schools		X	X		X	X
	BOCES		X	X		X	X
	State Community Colleges	X	X			X	
	Local District Junior Colleges		X	X		X	X
Connecticut	Comprehensive High Schools		X	X		X	X
	Regional Vocational-Technical Schools		X			X	
	Regional Vocational-Agriculture Centers		X			X	
	State Technical Colleges		X			X	
	Community Colleges		X			X	X
Delaware	Comprehensive High Schools		X			X	X
	Area Vocational Centers		X			X	
	Technical and Community Colleges		X			X	
District of Columbia	Comprehensive High Schools	O	X		O	X	
	Area Vocational High Schools	O	X		O	X	
Florida	Comprehensive High Schools		X	X	X	X	
	Area Vocational-Technical Centers		X	X	X	X	
	Community Colleges		X	X	X	X	

1 = Funds for capital expenses (facilities, equipment) which are allocated as undifferentiated components of operating reimbursements are not independently identified by funding source.
X = Source used.
O = Federal funds from Vocational Education Act and other Federal sources.

Table IV-3 (Continued)

Capital Funding Sources[1]

State	Institution Type	Construction Funding			Equipment Funding		
		Federal (VEA)	State	Local	Federal (VEA)	State	Local
Georgia	Comprehensive High Schools	0	X	X	0	X	X
	Area Vocational Centers	0	X	X	0	X	X
	Area Technical Schools	0	X			X	
	Junior Colleges	0	X			X	
Hawaii	Comprehensive High Schools		X		X	X	
	Community Colleges		X		X	X	
Idaho	Comprehensive High Schools			X	X	X	X
	Area Vocational-Technical Schools	X	X	X	X	X	
Illinois	Comprehensive High Schools			X			X
	Area Vocational Centers		X	X	X		X
	Community Colleges	0	X	X		X	X
Indiana	Comprehensive High Schools		X	X			X
	Area Vocational Programs - Cooperative	X	X	X	X		X
	Area Vocational Programs - Fiscal Agent	X	X	X	X		X
	Indiana Vocational-Technical College System	X	X		X		
Iowa	Comprehensive High Schools			X		X	X
	Merged Area Schools		X	X		X	X
Kansas	Comprehensive High Schools			X*			X*
	Area Vocational-Technical Schools	0	X	X*	A	X	X*
	Community Junior College			X*			X*
Kentucky	Vocational Departments of Secondary Schools			X			X
	Area Vocational Education Centers	0	X	X		X	X
	State Vocational-Technical Schools	X	X		X	X	
	Community Colleges		X			X	
Louisiana	Comprehensive High Schools			X	X	X	X
	Career Centers			X	X	X	X
	Postsecondary Voc-Tech Institutes		X			X	
	Community College		X			X	
Maine	Vocational Centers		X			X	
	Vocational Regions		X			X	
	Satellite Centers		X			X	
	Vocational-Technical Institutes		X			X	

1 = Funds for capital expenses (facilities, equipment) which are allocated as undifferentiated components of operating reimbursements are not independently identified by funding source.

X = Source used.
0 = Federal funds from Vocational Education Act and other Federal sources.
A = Federal funds exclusive of Vocational Education Act.
* = Includes bonding and indirect from cash accruals in operating funds.

Table IV-3 (Continued)

Capital Funding Sources[1]

State	Institution Type	Construction Funding			Equipment Funding		
		Federal (VEA)	State	Local	Federal (VEA)	State	Local
Maryland	Comprehensive High Schools		X			X	
	Vocational High Schools		X			X	
	Area Vocational Centers		X			X	
	Community Colleges		X	X		X	X
Massachusetts	Comprehensive High Schools		X	X		X	X
	Vocational High Schools		X	X		X	X
	Regional Vocational-Technical High Schools		X	X		X	X
	Community Colleges		X			X	
Michigan	Comprehensive High Schools			X	X		X
	Area Vocational Centers	0		X	X		X
	Community Colleges		X	X	X		X
Minnesota	Comprehensive High Schools			X	X	X	
	Cooperative Centers			X	X	X	
	Area Vocational-Technical Institutes			X		X	X
	Community Colleges		X			X	
Mississippi	Comprehensive High Schools		X	X		X	X
	Vocational Centers - Secondary	0	X	X		X	
	Vocational Centers - Junior Colleges	0	X	X		X	
Missouri	Comprehensive High Schools		X	X			X
	Area Vocational Centers	0		X	0		X
	Junior Colleges		X	X			X
Montana	Comprehensive High Schools	X	X	X	X	X	X
	Vocational-Technical Centers		X	X	X	X	X
	Community Colleges		X	X		X	X
Nebraska	Comprehensive High Schools			X	X		X
	Technical Community Colleges			X		X	X
Nevada	Comprehensive High Schools			X	X	X	X
	Area Vocational-Technical School			X	X	X	X
	Community Colleges		X		X	X	
New Hampshire	Comprehensive High Schools		X	X		X	X
	Area Vocational Centers		X			X	
	Vocational-Technical Colleges		X			X	
	Technical Institute		X			X	

1 = Funds for capital expenses (facilities, equipment) which are allocated as undifferentiated components of operating reimbursements are not independently identified by funding source.
X = Source used.
0 = Federal funds from Vocational Education Act and other Federal sources.
* = Indirect from cash accruals in operating funds.

Table IV-3 (Continued)

Capital Funding Sources[1]

State	Institution Type	Construction Funding			Equipment Funding		
		Federal (VEA)	State	Local	Federal (VEA)	State	Local
New Jersey	Comprehensive High Schools		X	X		X	X
	Area Vocational-Technical Schools	X	X	X	X	X	X
	Community Colleges		X	X		X	X
New Mexico	Comprehensive High Schools			X			X
	Area Vocational Schools	O	X	X	O	X	X
	Community and Junior Colleges	O	X	X	O	X	X
New York	Comprehensive High Schools		X	X		X	X
	Vocational High Schools		X	X		X	X
	BOCES	O	X	X	O	X	X
	Community Colleges		X	X		X	X
	Agricultural and Technical Colleges		X			X	
North Carolina	Comprehensive High Schools		X	X	X	X	X
	Shared-Time Centers		X	X	X	X	X
	Technical Institutes and Community Colleges	O		X		X	
North Dakota	Comprehensive High Schools			X	X	X	
	Vocational Centers		X		X	X	X
	Junior Colleges		X		X	X	X
	Independent Junior College			X	X	X	
Ohio	Comprehensive High Schools	O	X	X	O	X	X
	Joint Vocational School Districts	O	X	X	O	X	X
	Community Colleges		X			X	
	Technical Colleges		X			X	
	General and Technical Colleges		X			X	
Oklahoma	Comprehensive High Schools			X		X	
	Area Vocational-Technical Schools		X	X		X	
	Community and Junior Col. & Tech. Institutes		X			X	
Oregon	Comprehensive High Schools			X			X
	Community Colleges		X	X		X	X
Pennsylvania	Comprehensive and Vocational High Schools		X	X		X	X
	Area Vocational-Technical Schools	O	X	X	O	X	X
	Community Colleges	X	X	X		X	X
Rhode Island	Vocational Facilities		X			X	
	Junior College		X			X	

1 = Funds for capital expenses (facilities, equipment) which are allocated as undifferentiated components of operating reimbursements are not independently identified by funding source.
X = Source used.
O = Federal funds from Vocational Education Act and other Federal sources.

Table IV-3 (Continued)

Capital Funding Sources[1]

State	Institution Type	Construction Funding			Equipment Funding		
		Federal (VEA)	State	Local	Federal (VEA)	State	Local
South Carolina	Comprehensive High Schools			X			X
	Area Vocational Centers and Vocational Wings		X	X	X	X	
	Technical Colleges		X			X	
South Dakota	Comprehensive High Schools			X	X	X	X
	Multi-District Vocational Centers			X	X	X	X
	Vocational-Technical Schools	X	X	X	X	X	X
Tennessee	Comprehensive High Schools		X			X	
	Vocational Centers		X			X	
	Area Vocational-Technical Schools		X			X	
	Technical Institutes		X			X	
	Community Colleges		X			X	
Texas	Comprehensive High Schools			X	X	X	X
	Area Vocational Schools			X	X	X	X
	Community (Junior) Colleges			X	X	X	X
	Texas State Technical Institute		X			X	
Utah	Comprehensive High Schools			X			X
	Area Vocational Centers		X			X	
	Technical Colleges		X			X	
	Two-Year Colleges		X			X	
Vermont	High School/Area Vocational Centers		X	X		X	X
	Technical College		X			X	
Virginia	Comprehensive High Schools	O		X	O		X
	Area Vocational Centers	O		X	O		X
	Joint Vocational Centers	O		X	O		X
	Community Colleges		X			X	
Washington	Comprehensive High Schools	X	X	X	X	X	X
	Area Vocational-Technical Institutes		X	X		X	X
	Community Colleges		X	X		X	X
West Virginia	Comprehensive High Schools	O	X	X	X	X	X
	County Vocational Centers	O	X	X	X	X	X
	Area Vocational Centers	O	X	X	X	X	X
	Community Colleges		X			X	

1 = Funds for capital expenses (facilities, equipment) which are allocated as undifferentiated components of operating reimbursements are not independently identified by funding source.
X = Source used.
O = Federal funds from Vocational Education Act and other Federal sources.

Table IV-3 (Continued)

Capital Funding Sources[1]

State	Institution Type	Construction Funding			Equipment Funding		
		Federal (VEA)	State	Local	Federal (VEA)	State	Local
Wisconsin	Comprehensive High Schools		X	X		X	X
	Vocational Centers		X	X		X	X
	Voc-Tech and Adult Education Districts	O		X	X		X
Wyoming	Comprehensive High Schools		X	X	X	X	X
	Community Colleges		X	X		X	X
American Samoa	Comprehensive High Schools		X		X		
	Vocational Skill Center		X		X		
	Community College	A			X	X	
Guam	Vocational-Technical High School	X			X	X	
	Community College	X	X			X	
Puerto Rico	Comprehensive High Schools	X	X			X	
	Postsecondary Vocational-Technical Schools	X	X			X	
	Technical Institutes	X	X			X	
	Agricultural School	X	X			X	
	Special Vocational Centers	X	X			X	
	Tool and Die Making School	X	X			X	
Trust Territory	Comprehensive High School		X		X	X	
	Occupational Center		X		X	X	
	Nursing School		X		X	X	
	Community College		X		X	X	
Virgin Islands	Comprehensive High Schools	X	X		X	)	
	College of the Virgin Islands	Data not available			Data not available		

1 = Funds for capital expenses (facilities, equipment) which are allocated as undifferentiated components of operating reimbursements are not independently identified by funding source.
X = Source used.
O = Federal funds from Vocational Education Act and other Federal sources.
A = Federal funds exclusive of Vocational Education Act.

Table IV-4

Construction and Capital Equipment Funding Provisions

State	Institution Type	Funding Source	Construction		Capital Equipment	
			Allocation Model[1]	Rate or Range	Allocation Model[1]	Rate or Range
Alabama	Comprehensive High Schools	Federal	Variable	Up to 50% from ARC	Variable	Up to 50%
		State	Project	Variable	Project	DNA
		Local	Differential	Variable	Differential	DNA
	Area Vocational Centers	Federal	Variable	Up to 50% from ARC	Variable	Up to 50%
		State	Project	Variable	Project	DNA
		Local	Differential	Variable	Differential	DNA
	Technical Colleges and Technical Institutes	Federal	Variable	Up to 50% from ARC	Variable	Up to 50%
		State	Project	Variable	Project	DNA
		Local	---	---	---	---
	Junior and Community Colleges	Federal	Variable	Up to 50% from ARC	Variable	Up to 50%
		State	Project	Variable	Project	DNA
		Local	---	---	---	---
Alaska	Comprehensive High Schools (Boroughs & First Class Cities)	Federal	---	---	---	---
		State	Fixed	50%	Fixed	50%
		Local	Fixed	50%	Fixed	50%
	Comprehensive High Schools (REAA's)	Federal	---	---	---	---
		State	Fixed	100%	Fixed	100%
		Local	---	---	---	---
	Career Centers	Federal	---	---	---	---
		State	Fixed	50%	Fixed	50%
		Local	Fixed	50%	Fixed	50%
	Community Colleges	Federal	---	---	---	---
		State	Unit	100%	Unit	100%
		Local	---	---	---	---
Arizona	Comprehensive High Schools	Federal	---	---	Variable	5 - 10%
		State	---	---	Variable	5 - 10%
		Local	Fixed	100%	Differential	80 - 90%
	Community Colleges	Federal	---	---	---	---
		State	Unit	$500,000	Unit	100% - $135/FTE
		Local	Fixed	100%	---	---
Arkansas	Comprehensive High Schools	Federal	---	---	---	---
		State	---	---	Operating	$1,000+ per teaching unit
		Local	Fixed	100%	Differential	DNA
	Area High School Centers	Federal	---	---	---	---
		State	Variable	50%	Variable	50%
		Local	Variable	50%	Variable	50%
	Area Vocational Schools	Federal	---	---	---	---
		State	Fixed	100%	Fixed	100%
		Local	---	---	---	---
	Community Colleges	Federal	Variable	0 - 50%	---	---
		State	---	---	Fixed	100% (replacement)[2]
		Local	Fixed/Diff.	50 - 100%	Fixed	100% (initial)
California	Comprehensive High Schools	Federal	---	---	Operating	DNA
		State	Special	DNA	Operating	DNA
		Local	Differential	DNA	Operating	DNA
	Regional Occupational Centers	Federal	---	---	Operating	DNA
		State	Special	DNA	Operating	DNA
		Local	Differential	DNA	Operating	DNA
	Community Colleges	Federal	---	---	Variable	DNA
		State	Special	50%	Variable	DNA
		Local	Differential	50%	Differential	DNA

[1]Refer to Table IV-2.

[2]Allocated as part of operating cost authorization.

DNA: Data not available.

DATA IN THIS TABLE SHOULD BE USED ONLY IN THE CONTEXT OF THE SUPPLEMENTARY NOTE PROVIDED ON PAGE 79.

Table IV-4 (Continued)

Construction and Capital Equipment Funding Provisions

State	Institution Type	Funding Source	Construction		Capital Equipment	
			Allocation Model[1]	Rate or Range	Allocation Model[1]	Rate or Range
Colorado	Comprehensive High Schools	Federal	---	---	---	---
		State	Project	95%	Project	95%
		Local	Differential	5%	Differential	5%
	Area Vocational Schools - BOCES	Federal	---	---	---	---
		State	Project	95%	Project	95%
		Local	Differential	5%	Differential	5%
	Local District Junior Colleges	Federal	---	---	---	---
		State	Project	5%	Project	5%
		Local	Differential	95%	Differential	95%
	State Community Colleges	Federal	Project	5%	Project	5%
		State	Project	95%	Project	95%
		Local	---	---	---	---
Connecticut	Comprehensive High Schools	Federal	---	---	---	---
		State	Project	60 - 80%	Project	60 - 80%
		Local	Differential	20 - 40%	Differential	20 - 40%
	Regional Vocational-Technical Schools	Federal	---	---	---	---
		State	Project	100%	Project	100%
		Local	---	---	---	---
	Regional Vocational-Agriculture Centers	Federal	---	---	---	---
		State	Project	100%	Project	100%
		Local	---	---	---	---
	State Technical Colleges	Federal	---	---	---	---
		State	Project	100%	Project	100%
		Local	---	---	---	---
	Community Colleges	Federal	---	---	---	---
		State	Project	100%	Project	100%
		Local	---	---	---	---
Delaware	Comprehensive High Schools	Federal	---	---	---	---
		State	Fixed	100%	Fixed	100%
		Local	---	---	Special	Supplemental
	Area Vocational Centers	Federal	---	---	---	---
		State	Fixed	100%	Fixed	100%
		Local	---	---	Special	Supplemental
	Technical and Community Colleges	Federal	---	---	---	---
		State	Fixed	100%	Fixed	100%
		Local	---	---	---	---
District of Columbia	Comprehensive and Area Vocational High Schools	Federal	Project	30 - 50%	Project	30 - 50%
		State	Differential	50 - 70%	Differential	50 - 70%
		Local	---	---	---	---
Florida	Comprehensive High Schools	Federal	---	---	Operating	DNA
		State	Fixed	Up to 100%	Var./Oper.	Up to 100%
		Local	Differential	Non-approved costs	---	---
	Area Vocational-Technical Schools	Federal	---	---	Operating	DNA
		State	Fixed	Up to 100%	Var./Oper.	Up to 100%
		Local	Differential	Non-approved costs	---	---
	Community Colleges	Federal	---	---	Operating	DNA
		State	Fixed	Up to 100%	Var./Oper.	Up to 100%
		Local	Differential	Non-approved costs	---	---

[1]Refer to Table IV-2.

DNA: Data not available.

DATA IN THIS TABLE SHOULD BE USED ONLY IN THE CONTEXT OF THE SUPPLEMENTARY NOTE PROVIDED ON PAGE 79.

Table IV-4 (Continued)

Construction and Capital Equipment Funding Provisions

State	Institution Type	Funding Source	Construction		Capital Equipment	
			Allocation Model[1]	Rate or Range	Allocation Model[1]	Rate or Range
Georgia	Comprehensive High Schools	Federal	Fixed	(2)	Fixed	(2)
		State	Fixed	(2)	Fixed	(2)
		Local	Fixed	(2)	Fixed	(2)
	Area Vocational Centers	Federal	Fixed	(2)	Fixed	(2)
		State	Fixed	(2)	Fixed	(2)
		Local	Fixed	(2)	Fixed	(2)
	Area Technical Schools	Federal	DNA	DNA	DNA	DNA
		State	DNA	DNA	DNA	DNA
		Local	---	---	DNA	DNA
	Junior Colleges	Federal	DNA	DNA	---	---
		State	DNA	DNA	Project	100%
		Local	---	---	---	---
Hawaii	Comprehensive High Schools	Federal	---	---	Special	1 - 5%
		State	Fixed	100%	Special	95 - 99%
		Local	---	---	---	---
	Community Colleges	Federal	---	---	Special	1 - 5%
		State	Fixed	100%	Special	95 - 99%
		Local	---	---	---	---
Idaho	Comprehensive High Schools	Federal	---	---	Project	2%
		State	---	---	Project	3%
		Local	Fixed	100%	Differential	95%
	Area Voc-Tech Schools	Federal	Variable	28%	Project	25%
		State	Project	71%	Project	75%
		Local	Differential	1%	---	---
Illinois	Comprehensive High Schools	Federal	---	---	---	---
		State	---	---	---	---
		Local	Fixed	100%	Fixed	100%
	Area Vocational Centers	Federal	---	---	Variable	40-50-60%
		State	Variable	40-50-60%	Operating	DNA
		Local	Differential	Remainder	Differential	Remainder
	Community Colleges	Federal	Variable	13%	---	---
		State	Project	45%	Project	DNA
		Local	Differential	42% (minimum 25%)	Differential	DNA
Indiana	Comprehensive High Schools	Federal	---	---	---	---
		State	Operating	DNA	Special	IND
		Local	Fixed	100%	Special	IND
	Cooperative Area Programs	Federal	Variable	10%	Variable	10%
		State	Operating	DNA	Operating	DNA
		Local	Fixed	90%	Fixed	90%
	Indiana Vocational-Technical Colleges	Federal	Operating	DNA	Operating	DNA
		State	Operating	DNA	Operating	DNA
		Local	---	---	---	---
Iowa	Comprehensive High Schools	Federal	---	---	---	---
		State	---	---	Differential	DNA
		Local	Fixed	100%	Fixed	Up to 100%
	Merged Area Schools	Federal	---	---	---	---
		State	Project	DNA	Project	DNA
		Local	Differential	Approx. 100%	Differential	Up to 100%

[1] Refer to Table IV-2.

[2] In Georgia, different funding provisions apply to regions of the State included in the Appalachian Regional Commission and the Coastal Plains Regional Commission and in regions not included in either regional commission. (See Volume II for specific data.)

DNA: Data not available.

DATA IN THIS TABLE SHOULD BE USED ONLY IN THE CONTEXT OF THE SUPPLEMENTARY NOTE PROVIDED ON PAGE 79.

Table IV-4 (Continued)

Construction and Capital Equipment Funding Provisions

State	Institution Type	Funding Source	Construction		Capital Equipment	
			Allocation Model[1]	Rate or Range	Allocation Model[1]	Rate or Range
Kansas	Comprehensive High Schools	Federal	Operating	DNA	Operating	DNA
		State	Operating	DNA	Operating	DNA
		Local	Fixed	100%	Fixed	Up to 100%
	Area Vocational-Technical Schools	Federal	Project/Special	DNA	Fixed/Diff.	50%
		State	Project/Special	DNA	Project	DNA
		Local	Special	DNA	Fixed	DNA
	Community Junior Colleges	Federal	Operating	DNA	Operating	DNA
		State	Operating	DNA	Operating	DNA
		Local	Fixed	100%	Fixed	100%
Kentucky	Vocational Departments of Secondary Schools	Federal	---	---	---	---
		State	---	---	---	---
		Local	Fixed	100%	Fixed	100%
	Area Vocational Education Centers	Federal	Var./Fixed	(2)	---	---
		State	Unit	(2)	Fixed	(2)
		Local	Fixed	(2)	Fixed	(2)
	State Vocational-Technical Schools	Federal	Fixed	50%	Fixed	50%
		State	Fixed	50%	Fixed	50%
		Local	---	---	---	---
	Community Colleges	Federal	---	---	---	---
		State	Fixed	100%	Fixed	100%
		Local	---	---	---	---
Louisiana	Comprehensive High Schools	Federal	---	---	Variable	70%
		State	---	---	Variable	
		Local	Fixed	100%	Fixed	30%
	Career Centers	Federal	---	---	Variable	70%
		State	---	---	Variable	
		Local	Fixed	100%	Fixed	30%
	Postsecondary Vocational-Technical Institutions and Community College	Federal	---	---	---	---
		State	Project	100%	Project	100%
		Local	---	---	---	---
Maine	Vocational Centers	Federal	---	---	---	---
		State	Project	100%	Project	100%
		Local	---	---	---	---
	Vocational Regions	Federal	---	---	---	---
		State	Project	100%	Project	100%
		Local	---	---	---	---
	Satellite Centers	Federal	---	---	---	---
		State	Project	100%	Project	100%
		Local	---	---	---	---
	Vocational-Technical Institutes	Federal	---	---	---	---
		State	Project	100%	Project	100%
		Local	---	---	---	---

[1] Refer to Table IV-2.

[2] In Kentucky, different provisions apply to the funding of facilities and equipment in regions of the State which lie inside and outside of the Appalachian Regional Commission. (See Volume II for specific data.)

DNA: Data not available.

DATA IN THIS TABLE SHOULD BE USED ONLY IN THE CONTEXT OF THE SUPPLEMENTARY NOTE PROVIDED ON PAGE 79.

Table IV-4 (Continued)

Construction and Capital Equipment Funding Provisions

State	Institution Type	Funding Source	Construction		Capital Equipment	
			Allocation Model[1]	Rate or Range	Allocation Model[1]	Rate or Range
Maryland	Comprehensive and Vocational High Schools	Federal	---	---	---	---
		State	Fixed	100%	Fixed	100%
		Local	---	---	---	---
	Area Vocational Centers	Federal	---	---	---	---
		State	Fixed	100%	Fixed	100%
		Local	---	---	---	---
	Community Colleges	Federal	---	---	---	---
		State	Variable	DNA	Project	DNA
		Local	Project	DNA	Differential	DNA
Massachusetts	Comprehensive High Schools and Vocational High Schools	Federal	---	---	---	---
		State	Variable	50 - 65%	Variable	50 - 60%
		Local	Differential	35 - 50%	Differential	35 - 50%
	Regional Voc-Tech High Schools	Federal	---	---	---	---
		State	Variable	50 - 65%	Variable	50 - 65%
		Local	Differential	35 - 50%	Differential	35 - 50%
	Community Colleges	Federal	---	---	---	---
		State	Project	100%	Project	100%
		Local	---	---	---	---
Michigan	Comprehensive High Schools	Federal	---	---	Variable	45%
		State	---	---	---	---
		Local	Fixed	100%	Differential	55%
	Area Vocational Centers	Federal	Fixed	45%	Variable	45%
		State	---	---	Operating	DNA
		Local	Fixed	55%	Differential	55%
	Community Colleges	Federal	---	---	Variable	45%
		State	Project	Varies	Operating	DNA
		Local	Differential	DNA	Differential	55%
Minnesota	Comprehensive High Schools	Federal	---	---	Fixed	50%
		State	---	---	Fixed	50%
		Local	Fixed	100%	---	---
	Cooperative Centers	Federal	---	---	Fixed	50%
		State	---	---	Fixed	50%
		Local	Fixed	100%	---	---
	Area Vocational-Technical Institutes	Federal	---	---	---	---
		State	Operating	DNA	Unit	$2,200 per FTE
		Local	Fixed	100%	Differential	DNA
	Community Colleges	Federal	---	---	---	---
		State	Project	100%	Project	100%
		Local	---	---	---	---
Mississippi	Comprehensive High Schools	Federal	---	---	---	---
		State	Unit	Based on ADA	DNA	DNA
		Local	Differential	DNA	DNA	DNA
	Vocational Centers-Secondary Schools	Federal	Fixed	50%	---	---
		State	Special	DNA	Fixed	100%
		Local	Fixed	50%	---	---
	Vocational Centers-Junior Colleges	Federal	Fixed	50%	---	---
		State	---	---	Project	100%
		Local	Fixed	50%	---	---

[1]Refer to Table IV-2.

DNA: Data not available.

DATA IN THIS TABLE SHOULD BE USED ONLY IN THE CONTEXT OF THE SUPPLEMENTARY NOTE PROVIDED ON PAGE 79.

Table IV-4 (Continued)

Construction and Capital Equipment Funding Provisions

State	Institution Type	Funding Source	Construction		Capital Equipment	
			Allocation Model[1]	Rate or Range	Allocation Model[1]	Rate or Range
Missouri	Comprehensive High Schools	Federal	---	---	---	---
		State	Special/Unit	(2)	---	---
		Local	Differential	Approx. 100%	Fixed	100%
	Area Vocational Centers	Federal	Project	Up to 50%	Fixed	50%
		State	---	---	---	---
		Local	Differential	Up to 100%	Fixed	50%
	Junior Colleges	Federal	---	---	---	---
		State	Special/Unit	(2)	---	---
		Local	Differential	Approx. 100%	Fixed	100%
Montana	Comprehensive High Schools	Federal	Project	Less than 1%	Project	1%
		State	Project	Less than 1%	Project	13%
		Local	Differential	Approx. 99%	Differential	86%
	Vocational-Technical Centers	Federal	---	---	Project	15%
		State	Fixed	50%	Project	80%
		Local	Fixed	50%	Differential	5%
	Community Colleges	Federal	---	---	---	---
		State	Project	65%	Project	65%
		Local	Differential	35%	Differential	35%
Nebraska	Comprehensive High Schools	Federal	---	---	Variable	DNA
		State	---	---	---	---
		Local	Fixed	100%	Differential	DNA
	Technical Community Colleges	Federal	---	---	---	---
		State	---	---	Variable	DNA
		Local	Fixed	100%	Differential	DNA
Nevada	Comprehensive High Schools	Federal	---	---	Project	20%
		State	---	---	Project	30%
		Local	Fixed	100%	Differential	50%
	Area Vocational-Technical School	Federal	---	---	Project	20%
		State	---	---	Project	30%
		Local	Fixed	100%	Differential	50%
	Community Colleges	Federal	---	---	Project	5%
		State	Project	100%	Differential	95%
		Local	---	---	---	---
New Hampshire	Comprehensive High Schools	Federal	---	---	---	---
		State	Fixed	30-40-55%	Variable	30-40-55%
		Local	Differential	45-60-70%	Differential	45-60-70%
	Area Vocational Centers	Federal	---	---	---	---
		State	Fixed	100%	Project	100%
		Local	Special	Supplemental	Special	Supplemental
	Vocational-Technical Colleges & Technical Institute	Federal	---	---	---	---
		State	Project	100%	Project	100%
		Local	---	---	---	---

[1] Refer to Table IV-2.

[2] See Volume II for special data.

DNA: Data not available.

DATA IN THIS TABLE SHOULD BE USED ONLY IN THE CONTEXT OF THE SUPPLEMENTARY NOTE PROVIDED ON PAGE 79.

Table IV-4 (Continued)

Construction and Capital Equipment Funding Provisions

State	Institution Type	Funding Source	Construction		Capital Equipment	
			Allocation Model[1]	Rate or Range	Allocation Model[1]	Rate or Range
New Jersey	Comprehensive High Schools	Federal	---	---	---	---
		State	Variable	DNA	Variable	DNA
		Local	Variable	DNA	Variable	DNA
	Area Vocational-Technical Schools	Federal	Special	25%	Special	25%
		State	Special	25%	Special	25%
		Local	Differential	50%	Differential	50%
	Community Colleges	Federal	---	---	---	---
		State	Project	50%	Project	50%
		Local	Differential	50%	Differential	50%
New Mexico	Comprehensive High Schools	Federal	---	---	---	---
		State	---	---	---	---
		Local	Fixed	100%	Fixed	100%
	Area Vocational Schools	Federal	Project	DNA	Project	DNA
		State	Project	DNA	Project	DNA
		Local	Differential	DNA	Differential	DNA
	Community and Junior Colleges	Federal	Project	DNA	Project	DNA
		State	Project	DNA	Project	DNA
		Local	Differential	DNA	Differential	DNA
New York	Comprehensive and Vocational High Schools	Federal	---	---	---	---
		State	Variable	DNA	Variable	DNA
		Local	Differential	DNA	Differential	DNA
	BOCES	Federal	Project	Up to 80%[2]	Project	DNA
		State	Variable	DNA	Variable	DNA
		Local	Differential	DNA	Differential	DNA
	Community Colleges	Federal	---	---	---	---
		State	Fixed	50%	Fixed	50%
		Local	Fixed	50%	Fixed	50%
	Agricultural and Technical Colleges	Federal	---	---	---	---
		State	Fixed	100%	Fixed	100%
		Local	---	---	---	---
North Carolina	Comprehensive High Schools and Shared-Time Centers	Federal	---	---	Variable	25%
		State	Variable	DNA	Variable	25%
		Local	Differential	Up to 100%	Variable	50%
	Technical Institutes and Community Colleges	Federal	Project	26%	---	---
		State	Project	22%	Project/Oper.	100% (initial)
		Local	Differential	52%	---	---
North Dakota	Comprehensive High Schools	Federal	---	---	Variable	40 - 60%
		State	---	---	Variable	
		Local	Fixed	100%	Differential	40 - 60%
	Vocational Centers	Federal	---	---	---	---
		State	---	---	Project	100%
		Local	Fixed	100%	---	---
	Junior Colleges	Federal	---	---	---	---
		State	Fixed	100%	Project	100%
		Local	---	---	---	---
	Independent Junior Colleges	Federal	---	---	Unit	[40 - 60%]
		State	---	---	Unit	
		Local	Fixed	100%	Differential	40 - 60%

[1]Refer to Table IV-2.

[2]Applicable to schools located in the Appalachian Regional Commission.

DNA: Data not available.

DATA IN THIS TABLE SHOULD BE USED ONLY IN THE CONTEXT OF THE SUPPLEMENTARY NOTE PROVIDED ON PAGE 79.

Table IV-4 (Continued)

Construction and Capital Equipment Funding Provisions

State	Institution Type	Funding Source	Construction		Capital Equipment	
			Allocation Model[1]	Rate or Range	Allocation Model[1]	Rate or Range
Vermont	High School/ Area Vocational Centers	Federal	---	---	---	---
		State	Special	(2)	Special	(2)
		Local	Differential	(2)	Differential	(2)
	Technical College	Federal	---	---	---	---
		State	Fixed	100%	Fixed	100%
		Local	---	---	---	---
Virginia	Comprehensive High Schools and Area Vocational Centers	Federal	Variable	40 - 60%	Variable	40 - 60%
		State	---	---	---	---
		Local	Differential	40 - 60%	Differential	40 - 60%
	Joint Vocational Centers	Federal	Variable	40 - 60%	Variable	40 - 60%
		State	---	---	---	---
		Local	Differential	40 - 60%	Differential	40 - 60%
	Community Colleges	Federal	---	---	---	---
		State	Fixed	100%	Fixed	100%
		Local	---	---	---	---
Washington	Comprehensive High Schools	Federal	Variable	2%	Variable	2%
		State	Variable	98%	Variable	98%
		Local	Differential	Nominal	Differential	Nominal
	Area Vocational-Technical Institutes	Federal	---	---	---	---
		State	Variable	90%	Variable	90%
		Local	Differential	10%	Differential	10%
	Community Colleges	Federal	---	---	---	---
		State	Fixed	50%	Fixed	50%
		Local	Fixed	50%	Fixed	50%
West Virginia	Comprehensive High Schools and Area Vocational Centers	Federal	Variable	DNA	Variable	[50%]
		State	Special	DNA	Variable	
		Local	Differential	DNA	Fixed	50%
	Community Colleges	Federal	---	---	---	---
		State	Fixed	100%	Fixed	100%
		Local	---	---	---	---
Wisconsin	Comprehensive High Schools and Vocational Centers	Federal	---	---	---	---
		State	Operating	DNA	Operating	DNA
		Local	Fixed	100%	Fixed	100%
	Vocational-Technical and Adult Education Districts	Federal	Project	5 - 8%	Variable	DNA
		State	Operating	3 - 5%	Operating	DNA
		Local	Differential	87 - 92%	Differential	Up to 100%
Wyoming	Comprehensive High Schools	Federal	---	---	Variable	1%
		State	Unit	$3,200 per classroom unit	Variable	46%
		Local	Differential	DNA	Differential	53%
	Community Colleges	Federal	---	---	---	---
		State	Fixed	50%	Fixed	50%
		Local	Fixed	50%	Fixed	50%
American Samoa	Comprehensive High Schools	Federal	---	---	Fixed	100%
		State	Fixed	100%	---	---
		Local	---	---	---	---
	Vocational Skill Center	Federal	---	---	Fixed	100%
		State	Fixed	100%	---	---
		Local	---	---	---	---
	Community College	Federal	Fixed	100%	Variable	25%
		State	---	---	Project	75%
		Local	---	---	---	---

[1] Refer to Table IV-2.

[2] See Volume II for specific data.

DNA: Data not available.

DATA IN THIS TABLE SHOULD BE USED ONLY IN THE CONTEXT OF THE SUPPLEMENTARY NOTE PROVIDED ON PAGE 79.

Table IV-4 (Continued)

Construction and Capital Equipment Funding Provisions

State	Institution Type	Funding Source	Construction		Capital Equipment	
			Allocation Model[1]	Rate or Range	Allocation Model[1]	Rate or Range
Guam	Vocational-Technical High School	Federal	Fixed	100%	Project	20%
		State	---	---	Project	80%
		Local	---	---	---	---
	Community College	Federal	Fixed	50%	---	---
		State	Fixed	50%	Fixed	100%
		Local	---	---	---	---
Puerto Rico	All Institutions	Federal	Special	Up to 50% (VEA) Up to 80% (EDA)	---	---
		State	Fixed	100%	Project	100%
		Local	---	---	---	---
Trust Territory	Comprehensive High School	Federal	---	---	Project	12%
		State	Fixed	100%	Project	88%
		Local	---	---	---	---
	Occupational Center	Federal	---	---	Project	12%
		State	Fixed	100%	Project	88%
		Local	---	---	---	---
	Nursing School	Federal	---	---	Project	6 - 7%
		State	Fixed	100%	Project	93 - 94%
		Local	---	---	---	---
	Community College	Federal	---	---	Project	6 - 7%
		State	Fixed	100%	Project	93 - 94%
		Local	---	---	---	---
Virgin Islands	Comprehensive High Schools	Federal	Fixed	40%	Variable	10 - 20%
		State	Differential	60%	Project	80 - 90%
		Local	---	---	---	---
	College of the Virgin Islands	Federal	DNA	DNA	DNA	DNA
		State	DNA	DNA	DNA	DNA
		Local	DNA	DNA	DNA	DNA

[1]Refer to Table IV-2.

DNA: Data not available.

DATA IN THIS TABLE SHOULD BE USED ONLY IN THE CONTEXT OF THE SUPPLEMENTARY NOTE PROVIDED ON PAGE 79.

CHAPTER V

VOCATIONAL EDUCATION PROGRAM FUNDING MODELS

As the cost of education increases, the excess cost of vocational education programs makes them increasingly susceptible to curtailment and, in some communities, to elimination.

The method by which State and Federal funds are used to support vocational education programs and institutions could have a significant impact on the effective utilization of such resources in meeting the demands for a trained and educated manpower pool.

This study produced little evidence to suggest that the policies and provisions under which vocational education programs are funded enable State agencies to allocate resources in ways that promote the most efficient use of these resources. This investigation did, however, produce information that provides an important insight into the roles of State and Federal funds in supporting and promoting the expansion of vocational education programs at all levels.

Tables presented in this chapter summarize the general provisions under which State and Federal funds are currently allocated to the support of vocational education programs. A detailed analysis of these funding provisions was outside the scope of this study. However, a preliminary review of these data has raised many questions relating to the effectiveness of alternative programs for the distribution of funds and the extent to which these policies promote the achievement of the goals of Federal legislation.

The following discussions are intended to highlight some of the major observations suggested by available data. The reader, however, is cautioned that these observations are based solely on data compiled in this study and relate only to the expenditure of Part B funds for general program development and support. These observations should not be used to draw conclusions about the effectiveness of the total vocational education finance systems of the States. Rather, they are intended to suggest major areas in which further study, undertaken in the context of the States' total vocational education finance system, is warranted.

The major areas in which available data suggest the need for further study are:

- The effectiveness of funding policies in promoting program development in response to priority needs as opposed to simply providing support to vocational education programs (i.e., the leadership vs. program support role of State and Federal funds).

- The effectiveness of alternative funding programs in promoting the implementation of State policy.

- The extent to which funding programs address the needs of vocational education programs in local education agencies and effectively supplement local funds.

General observations relating to these questions are summarized in the following discussion. (For the interested reader, descriptions of the funding systems of each State, on which the following general observations are based, are presented in Volume II of this report.)

The Leadership vs. Program Support Role of State and Federal Funds

Most States attach the caveat of "approved programs" to their definition of eligibility for the receipt of State and Federal vocational education funds. However, little evidence exists to suggest that this provision includes program "need" as a criterion for program approval and funding. Rather, program approval appears to be generally determined on the basis of such factors as staff qualifications and the adequacy of facilities, equipment, and curricula. Moreover, the majority of the funding programs identified appear to have been developed solely as means of distributing resources for the support of programs whose existence and cost are determined by local authorities.

Major funding policy changes intended to improve the overall level of support for vocational education from State and Federal funds have occurred since the implementation of the Vocational Education Act of 1963. However, available data do not demonstrate that these changes have resulted in policies and practices which cause these funds to have a catalytic effect, particularly one which has had a significant impact on the course of local program development.

As reported in later sections of this chapter, some States have developed funding procedures that permit the State Agencies to allocate funds in accordance with programs and project priority. However, the majority of the funding programs identified in this study -- especially those applied to the funding of vocational education in secondary schools -- reflect the application of generalized funding rules that result in the distribution of funds based on factors that are not clearly associated with program demand.

It may be assumed that increased funding, from both State and Federal sources, has played an important role in the general development of vocational education. However, there is no evidence to support the position that this increase in general support has been paralleled by changes in policy and allocation procedures which result in the expenditure of such funds in ways which would result in the implementation of specific State Agency policy.

This is not to say that such changes have not occurred. Rather it is a recognition that available evidence is insufficient to provide a basis for verifying the assumption that they have. Clearly this is a major issue warranting further investigation.

Impact of Funding Provisions on Local Vocational Education Programs

The formula allocation requirements that dictate the distribution of Federal funds require that adequate consideration be given to community factors -- unemployment rates, ability to pay, etc. However, no evidence exists to support the assumption that differential allocations resulting from such provisions have a direct impact on the effectiveness of the local vocational education program; nor is there sufficient evidence to suggest that the formula criteria required by Federal legislation will result in the development of vocational education programs that are most responsive to the needs they are intended to address. That is, while the formula allocation provisions generally assure that areas which, by definition, have the highest need receive the most Federal funds, little evidence exists to suggest that this provision for the distribution of funds will result in the most effective use of Federal funds.

The GAO report noted this fact as evidence that effective planning is not taking place. In fact, one could probably argue that the formula allocation requirement for the distribution of Federal funds actually reduces the effectiveness of State planning activities because of the limitations this formula imposes on the State's use of Federal funds.

A review of the funding programs of the 56 States and Territories also suggests that the Federal funds may not have the optimum effect because of the role these funds play as an interdependent -- as opposed to independent -- component of State vocational education finance programs. Specifically, the funding programs of several States have been designed so that the formula distribution of Federal funds to local education agencies affects only the State allocation to such agencies and has little or no effect on the amount of the program cost borne by local agencies. While other aspects of the vocational education finance programs in these States may effectively complement the characteristics identified in this study, the results of this study suggest that a major study of the effectiveness of total vocational education funding programs and, in particular, the impact of the formula distribution provisions of Federal legislation, is required before significant conclusions are drawn.

The Effectiveness of Alternative Funding Programs

Notwithstanding the concerns expressed above, many States have developed program funding policies that complement their policies for program and system development and provide important examples from which much can be learned about the potential impact of integrated program funding and agency policy provisions. For example, many States have implemented differential funding provisions for different institutional types (e.g., area vocational centers versus comprehensive high schools). These provisions are intended to promote the development and use of certain institutional delivery systems. However, the differences that exist in these provisions, as they have been developed in different States, and the differences that exist in the institutional systems they are designed to promote, preclude the drawing of general conclusions regarding the overall impact of such provisions vis-a-vis the effectiveness of the total vocational education delivery system and impact of the overall resource allocation plan.

Available evidence suggests that differential funding provisions do have an impact on the development of different types of institutions. However, whether such provisions have a net positive impact relative to the results which might have been obtained under another funding provision remains to be determined. No information exists to suggest how much of an "incentive differential" is necessary to promote the development of a preferred system and how much of the differential allocations are excessive with respect to the objectives of such funding policies.

Further, it is important to assess the degree to which differential funding programs, which appear to have had their greatest impact on the development of "area vocational center" systems, have contributed to the most effective development of total vocational education programs of their respective States. Such a study would inevitably include an attempt to determine what is the most cost effective institutional vehicle for the delivery of vocational education services.

Vocational Education Program Support Policies and Practices

Tables V-1 and V-2 on the following pages present "classifying definitions" for the characterization of the vocational education program funding practices of each State; Table V-3 presents a summary of the funding provisions applied to each institution in each State.

NOTE: In interpreting these tables, it should be noted that the complex nature of most States' vocational education program funding systems virtually defies simple classification. General provisions which apply to the use of State and Federal funds often differ for similar institutions, or may be applied in multiple combinations. Data provided in Table V-3 are intended solely for use in the comparative study of different funding provisions as they are most commonly applied. Since this study was not inherently concerned with describing State vocational education funding systems, no attempt was made to fully document systems identified by respondents as "highly complex," "variable" or otherwise difficult to capsulize meaningfully with clarity. In many instances, these provisions make it impossible to meaningfully describe specific funding provisions or estimate the portion of the total program cost in each institution provided by funds from different sources. Readers are, therefore, advised to review in detail the program descriptions of each State (contained in Volume II of this report) for detailed descriptions of each State's funding system.

It is also important to note that data provided by respondents interviewed in this study are not wholly consistent with data collected by the Federal (BOAE) reporting system. While in some instances substantial differences exist in these two data sources, the limited time and resources available to the study precluded a resolution of these discrepancies.

Table V-1

Program Support Allocation Funding Unit

Type	Description
INSTITUTIONAL (or Vocational Education Program) Budget Funding	Institutional budget funding refers to program support policies under which the institutional (or vocational education program) budget as a whole serves as the basis for the computation of program support allocations.
PROGRAM (or Cost Center Funding)	Program (or cost center) funding refers to programs under which State and/or Federal funds are allocated to institutions on the basis of separate cost centers or program components (such as instruction, administration, guidance, etc.). Program (or cost center) funding reimbursements are generally determined using fixed or variable percentage funding programs, although several States also have "added cost" funding programs which apply to instructional program funding. (For costs other than instructional costs special provisions generally define a maximum allocation amount.)
UNIT Funding	Unit funding refers to program funding policies under which State and/or Federal funds are distributed based on units of educational services measured in terms of something other than cost. Such support programs are generally associated with flat grant programs which entitle institutions to a fixed reimbursement per full-time equivalent student (FTE), per teaching unit, or per contact hour. In some instances, however, unit fundng may be employed in combination with fixed or variable percentage (formula) funding.
PROJECT Funding	Project funding refers to program funding policies under which State and/or Federal funds are allocated as grants for special purposes. (While project funding is used for some purposes in all States, the use of the term in the context of this discussion refers to an exclusive funding procedure which is used in lieu of, rather than in addition to, other general program support provisions identified above.)
ENTITLEMENT Funding	Entitlement funding refers to program funding policies under which funds are allocated by formula without reference to specific units of accounting.
SUPPLEMENTAL Funding	Supplemental funding refers to a provision under which the amount funded from the source noted is determined as either a) the difference between the amount funded from other sources and the total amount to be paid from all designated sources, or b) funds used for services not covered by the basic program support funding procedures.
SALARY Schedule	The amount funded from the source identified is based on a fixed salary or percentage salary reimbursement schedule.
SPECIAL-Other	Provision not elsewhere identified -- see individual State reports, in Volume II for special provisions. (The designation "SPECIAL" is used where funding provisions are complex and cannot be described in terms of the above classes or where specific information was not obtained from respondents.)

Table V-2

Program Cost Computation Procedures

Type	Description
FIXED Percentage Funding	Fixed percentage funding refers to provisions under which a fixed percentage of the cost base (see Table V-1) is reimbursed with State and/or Federal funds.
VARIABLE Percentage Funding	Variable percentage funding refers to provisions under which the percentage of the cost base (see Table V-1) to be reimbursed with State and/or Federal funds is determined by formula or through some other provisions which results in differential reimbursement schema.
MIXED (Fixed/Variable) Funding	Mixed funding programs refers to either provisions under which (a) funding from the source indicated has both a fixed and a variable component or (b) the total percentage of the cost base (see Table V-1) to be reimbursed from State and Federal funds is fixed by policy but where the allocation from one or the other sources (generally the Federal source) is determined by formula (variable percentage funding.)
Fixed ALLOCATION Funding	Fixed allocation funding refers to provisions under which State and/or Federal funds are distributed for program support based on a fixed amount per payment "unit" (i.e., FTE, etc.) -- the amount of which is determined by policy independent of any provisions of fixed or variable percentage funding. (Includes foundation funding.)
ADDED COST-Funding	Added cost funding refers to provisions under which State and/or Federal funds are allocated to institutions under provisions intended to defray the added costs of individual vocational education programs. These programs may be based on absolute cost differences (in which differential rates are defined in terms as specific amounts to be reimbursed for different programs) or relative cost differentials (in which differential rates are defined in terms of multiples of a base program support rate.)
NEGOTIATED Funding	Negotiated funding refers to provisions under which State and/or Federal support for an institution's vocational education program is determined on some basis other than those defined above. Generally, such provisions apply only to protect funding programs and to the funding of State institutions and other (generally postsecondary) institutions whose budgets are determined by legislative action.
DIFFERENTIAL Funding	The share of the program cost paid from a differential funding source is determined as the difference between the total amount to be funded from two or more sources and the amount allocated from other sources.
Differential RATE Funding	Program funding based on differential multiples of a base unit amount or a differential amount based on total program cost (as opposed to added cost).

Table V-3

Operating Cost Support Programs in Different States and Institutions*

State	Institution	Funding Source	Program Cost Allocation Unit[1]	Cost Share Computation	% of Cost
Alabama	Comprehensive High Schools	Federal	Variable	Variable	DNA
		State	Entitlement	Variable	DNA
		Local	Institutional	Differential	DNA
	Area Vocational Centers	Federal	Variable	Variable	DNA
		State	Entitlement	Variable	DNA
		Local	Institutional	Differential	DNA
	Technical Colleges and Institutes	Federal	Entitlement	Variable	DNA
		State	Special	Negotiated	DNA
		Local	---	---	---
	Junior and Community Colleges	Federal	Entitlement	Variable	DNA
		State	Special	Negotiated	DNA
		Local	---	---	---
Alaska	Comprehensive High Schools	Federal	Supplemental	Negotiated	---
		State	Unit	Allocation	100
		Local	Supplemental	Differential	---
	Career Centers	Federal	Supplemental	Negotiated	---
		State	Unit	Allocation	100
		Local	Supplemental	Differential	---
	Community Colleges	Federal	Supplemental	Negotiated	---
		State	Unit	Allocation	100[3]
		Local	---	---	---
Arizona	Comprehensive High Schools	Federal	Entitlement	Variable	25
		State	Unit	Allocation	15
		Local	Institutional	Differential	60
	Community Colleges	Federal	Entitlement	Variable	10
		State	Unit	Allocation	50[4]
		Local	Institutional	Differential	40[3]
Arkansas	Comprehensive High Schools	Federal	Entitlement	Fixed	15
		State	Entitlement	Fixed	35
		Local	Institutional	Fixed	50
	Area High School Centers	Federal	Program	Allocation	25
		State	Program/Salary	Allocation/Fixed	45
		Local	Institutional	Differential	30
	Postsecondary Area Vocational Schools	Federal	Institutional	Variable	14-1/2
		State	Institutional	Variable	85
		Tuition	---	---	1/2
	Community Colleges	Federal	---	---	---
		State	Institutional	Fixed	100[3]
		Local	---	---	---

[1]Refer to Table V-1.

[2]Refer to Table V-2.

[3]Includes tuition.

[4]Differential rates apply to general and vocational education programs.

DNA: Data not available. (Funding provisions do not permit meaningful and/or consistent presentation of aggregated summaries of source/cost share data.)

*Figures presented in "% of Cost" column refer to basic program costs. Where special project funding or supplemental funding provisions exist, the "Program Cost Allocation Unit" and "Cost Share Computation Basis" are identified with no data provided for "% of Cost."

DATA IN THIS TABLE SHOULD BE USED ONLY IN THE CONTEXT OF THE SUPPLEMENTARY NOTE PROVIDED ON PAGE 103.

Table V-3 (Continued)

Operating Cost Support Programs in Different States and Institutions*

State	Institution	Funding Source	Program Cost Allocation Unit[1]	Cost Share Computation[2]	% of Cost
California	Comprehensive High Schools	Federal	Entitlement	Variable	10
		State	Entitlement	Variable	30
		Local	Institutional	Differential	60
	Regional Occupational Centers	Federal	Entitlement	Variable	10
		State	Entitlement	Variable	30
		Local	Institutional	Differential	60
	Community Colleges	Federal	Entitlement	Variable	10
		State	Entitlement	Variable	[90]
		Local	Institutional	Differential	
Colorado	Comprehensive High Schools	Federal	---	---	---
		State	Special	Variable	50
		Local	Institutional	Differential	50
	Area Vocational Schools - BOCES	Federal	Special	DNA	DNA
		State	Unit	Allocation	DNA
		Local	Institutional	Differential	DNA
	State Community Colleges	Federal	Special	DNA	DNA
		State	Unit	Allocation	DNA
		Local	Institutional	Differential	DNA
	Local District Junior Colleges	Federal	Special	DNA	DNA
		State	Unit	Allocation	DNA
		Local	Institutional	Differential	DNA
Connecticut	Comprehensive High Schools	Federal	Entitlement	Variable	DNA
		State	Entit. (Unit)	Variable	DNA
		Local	Institutional	Differential	DNA
	Regional Voc-Tech Schools, Regional Vocational-Agriculture Centers	Federal	---	---	---
		State	Institutional	Fixed	100
		Local	---	---	---
	State Technical Colleges	Federal	---	---	---
		State	Institutional	Fixed	100[3]
		Local	---	---	---
	Community Colleges	Federal	---	---	---
		State	Institutional	Fixed	100[3]
		Local	---	---	---

[1]Refer to Table V-1.

[2]Refer to Table V-2.

[3]Includes tuition.

[4]Differential rates apply to general and vocational education programs.

DNA: Data not available. (Funding provisions do not permit meaningful and/or consistent presentation of aggregated summaries of source/cost share data.)

*Figures presented in "% of Cost" column refer to basic program costs. Where special project funding or supplemental funding provisions exist, the "Program Cost Allocation Unit" and "Cost Share Computation Basis" are identified with no data provided for "% of Cost."

DATA IN THIS TABLE SHOULD BE USED ONLY IN THE CONTEXT OF THE SUPPLEMENTARY NOTE PROVIDED ON PAGE 103.

Table V-3 (Continued)

Operating Cost Support Programs in Different States and Institutions*

State	Institution	Funding Source	Program Cost Allocation Unit[1]	Cost Share Computation[2]	% of Cost
Delaware	Comprehensive High Schools	Federal	Project	Negotiated	---
		State	Unit	Rate	70
		Local	Institutional	Differential	30
	Area Vocational Centers	Federal	Project	Negotiated	---
		State	Unit	Rate	70
		Local	Institutional	Differential	30
	Technical and Community Colleges	Federal	Project	Negotiated	2
		State	Institutional	Allocation	98
		Local	---	---	---
District of Columbia	Comprehensive High Schools	Federal	Special	DNA	5
		State	Special	DNA	95
		Local	---	---	---
	Area Vocational High Schools	Federal	Proj./Negot.	DNA	30
		State	Unit	DNA	70
		Local	---	---	---
Florida	Comprehensive High Schools	Federal	Project/Variable	Negotiated	---
		State	Unit	Alloc./Added	70
		Local	Institutional	Differential	30
	Area Vocational-Technical Centers	Federal	Project/Variable	Negotiated	---
		State	Unit	Alloc./Added	70
		Local	Institutional	Differential	30
	Community Colleges	Federal	Project/Unit	Negotiated	DNA
		State	Unit	Allocation	DNA
		Local	Institutional	Differential	DNA
Georgia	Comprehensive High Schools	Federal	Supplemental	Variable/Added	5
		State	Salary/Special	Variable/Added	90
		Local	Institutional	Differential	5
	Area Vocational Centers	Federal	Supplemental	Variable/Added	5
		State	Salary/Special	Variable/Added	90
		Local	Institutional	Differential	5
	Area Technical Schools	Federal	Institutional	Variable	16
		State	Institutional	Variable	74
		Local	Institutional	Differential	10
	Junior Colleges	Federal	Institutional	Variable	16
		State	Institutional	Variable	74
		Local	Institutional	Differential	10

[1]Refer to Table V-1.

[2]Refer to Table V-2.

[3]Includes tuition.

[4]Differential rates apply to general and vocational education programs.

DNA: Data not available. (Funding provisions do not permit meaningful and/or consistent presentation of aggregated summaries of source/cost share data.)

*Figures presented in "% of Cost" column refer to basic program costs. Where special project funding or supplemental funding provisions exist, the "Program Cost Allocation Unit" and "Cost Share Computation Basis" are identified with no data provided for "% of Cost."

DATA IN THIS TABLE SHOULD BE USED ONLY IN THE CONTEXT OF THE SUPPLEMENTARY NOTE PROVIDED ON PAGE 103.

Table V-3 (Continued)

Operating Cost Support Programs in Different States and Institutions*

State	Institution	Funding Source	Program Cost Allocation Unit[1]	Cost Share Computation[2]	% of Cost
Hawaii	Comprehensive High Schools	Federal	Institutional	Variable	14-17
		State	Institutional	Variable	83-86
		Local	---	---	---
	Community Colleges	Federal	Institutional	Variable	14-17
		State	Institutional	Variable	83-86[3]
		Local	---	---	---
Idaho	Comprehensive High Schools	Federal	Supplemental	Variable	DNA
		State	Special	Variable	DNA
		Local	Institutional	Differential	DNA
	Area Voc-Tech Schools	Federal	Institutional	Formula	100
		State	Institutional	Formula	
		Local	---	---	---
Illinois	Comprehensive High Schools	Federal	Program/Unit	Added Cost	6.5
		State	Program/Unit	Added Cost	6.5
		Local	Institutional	Differential	87
	Area Vocational Centers	Federal	Program/Unit	Added Cost	6.5
		State	Program/Unit	Added Cost	6.5
		Local	Institutional	Differential	87
	Community Colleges	Federal	Project	Variable	5
		State	Program	Added Cost	45
		Local	Institutional	Differential	50[3]
Indiana	Comprehensive High Schools	Federal	Supplemental	Added Cost	---
		State	Unit/Supp.	Alloc./Added Cost	DNA
		Local	Institutional	Rate	DNA
	Cooperative Area Programs	Federal	Supplemental	Added Cost	---
		State	Unit/Supp.	Alloc./Added Cost	DNA
		Local	Institutional	Differential	DNA
	Indiana Voc-Tech College System	Federal	Project	Negotiated	---
		State	Institutional	Fixed	100
		Local	---	---	---
Iowa	Comprehensive High Schools	Federal	Program	Variable	DNA
		State	Unit/Program	Variable	DNA
		Local	Institutional	Differential	DNA
	Merged Area Schools	Federal	Program	Variable	28
		State	Program	Variable	51
		Local	Institutional	Differential	21[3]

[1]Refer to Table V-1.

[2]Refer to Table V-2.

[3]Includes tuition.

[4]Differential rates apply to general and vocational education programs.

DNA: Data not available. (Funding provisions do not permit meaningful and/or consistent presentation of aggregated summaries of source/cost share data.)

*Figures presented in "% of Cost" column refer to basic program costs. Where special project funding or supplemental funding provisions exist, the "Program Cost Allocation Unit" and "Cost Share Computation Basis" are identified with no data provided for "% of Cost."

DATA IN THIS TABLE SHOULD BE USED ONLY IN THE CONTEXT OF THE SUPPLEMENTARY NOTE PROVIDED ON PAGE 103.

Table V-3 (Continued)

Operating Cost Support Programs in Different States and Institutions*

State	Institution	Funding Source	Program Cost Allocation Unit[1]	Cost Share Computation[2]	% of Cost
Kansas	Comprehensive High Schools	Federal	Entitlement	Variable	DNA
		State	Entitlement	Variable	DNA
		Local	Institutional	Differential	DNA
	Area Voc-Tech Schools	Federal	Entitlement	Variable	DNA
		State	Entitlement	Variable	DNA
		Local	Institutional	Differential	DNA
	Community Junior Colleges	Federal	Entitlement	Variable	DNA
		State	Unit	Var./Mixed	DNA
		Local	Institutional	Differential	DNA
Kentucky	Vocational Departments of Secondary Schools	Federal	Program	Variable	DNA
		State	Unit	Variable	DNA
		Local	Institutional	Differential	DNA
	Area Vocational Education Centers	Federal	Entitlement	Variable	DNA
		State	Unit	Allocation	DNA
		Local	---	---	---
	State Voc-Tech Schools	Federal	Entitlement	Variable	DNA
		State	Institutional	Variable	DNA
		Local	---	---	---
	Community College	Federal	Special	Negotiated	DNA
		State	Institutional	Negotiated	DNA
		Local	---	---	---
Louisiana	Comprehensive High Schools	Federal	Unit	Variable	25
		State	Salary	Allocation	11
		Local	Institutional	Differential	64
	Career Centers	Federal	Unit	Variable	25
		State	Salary	Allocation	11
		Local	Institutional	Differential	64
	Postsecondary Vocational Technical Institutions	Federal	Supplemental	Variable	30
		State	Institutional	Negotiated	70
		Local	---	---	---
	Community College	Federal	Project	Variable	DNA
		State	Institutional	Negotiated	DNA
		Local	---	---	---

[1]Refer to Table V-1.

[2]Refer to Table V-2.

[3]Includes tuition.

[4]Differential rates apply to general and vocational education programs.

DNA: Data not available. (Funding provisions do not permit meaningful and/or consistent presentation of aggregated summaries of source/cost share data.)

*Figures presented in "% of Cost" column refer to basic program costs. Where special project funding or supplemental funding provisions exist, the "Program Cost Allocation Unit" and "Cost Share Computation Basis" are identified with no data provided for "% of Cost."

DATA IN THIS TABLE SHOULD BE USED ONLY IN THE CONTEXT OF THE SUPPLEMENTARY NOTE PROVIDED ON PAGE 103.

Table V-3 (Continued)

Operating Cost Support Programs in Different States and Institutions*

State	Institution	Funding Source	Program Cost Allocation Unit[1]	Cost Share Computation[2]	% of Cost
Maine	Satellite Centers	Federal	Project/Special	Variable	---
		State	Entitlement	Variable	90
		Local	Institutional	Differential	10
	Vocational Centers and Vocational Regions	Federal	Project/Special	Variable	---
		State	Institutional	Fixed	90
		Local	Institutional	Differential	10
	Voc-Tech Institutes	Federal	Project/Special	Variable	---
		State	Institutional	Fixed	100[3]
		Local	---	---	---
Maryland	Comprehensive High Schools	Federal	Project	Variable	---
		State	Unit/Special	Var./Alloc.	55
		Local	Institutional	Differential	45
	Vocational High Schools	Federal	Project	Variable	---
		State	Unit/Special	Var./Alloc.	55
		Local	Institutional	Differential	45
	Area Vocational Centers	Federal	Project	Variable	---
		State	Unit/Special	Var./Alloc.	55
		Local	Institutional	Differential	45
	Community Colleges	Federal	Special	Variable	[50]
		State	Unit	Allocation	
		Local	Institutional	Differential	50[3]
Massachusetts	Comprehensive High Schools	Federal	Project	Variable/Negotiated	---
		State	Institutional	Variable	50
		Local	Institutional	Differential	50
	Vocational High Schools	Federal	Project	Vareible/Negotiated	---
		State	Institutional	Variable	50
		Local	Institutional	Differential	50
	Regional Vocational-Technical High Schools	Federal	Project	Variable/Negotiated	---
		State	Institutional	Variable	50
		Local	Institutional	Differential	50
	Community Colleges	Federal	---	---	---
		State	Institutional	Fixed	100[3]
		Local	---	---	---

[1]Refer to Table V-1.

[2]Refer to Table V-2.

[3]Includes tuition.

[4]Differential rates apply to general and vocational education programs.

DNA: Data not available. (Funding provisions do not permit meaningful and/or consistent presentation of aggregated summaries of source/cost share data.)

*Figures presented in "% of Cost" column refer to basic program costs. Where special project funding or supplemental funding provisions exist, the "Program Cost Allocation Unit" and "Cost Share Computation Basis" are identified with no data provided for "% of Cost."

DATA IN THIS TABLE SHOULD BE USED ONLY IN THE CONTEXT OF THE SUPPLEMENTARY NOTE PROVIDED ON PAGE 103.

Table V-3 (Continued)

Operating Cost Support Programs in Different States and Institutions*

State	Institution	Funding Source	Program Cost Allocation Unit[1]	Cost Share Computation[2]	% of Cost
Michigan	Comprehensive High Schools	Federal	Institutional	Variable	DNA
		State	Institutional	Variable	DNA
		Local	Institutional	Differential	DNA
	Area Vocational Centers	Federal	Institutional	Variable	DNA
		State	Institutional	Variable	DNA
		Local	Institutional	Differential	DNA
	Community Colleges	Federal	Project	Variable	DNA
		State	Unit	Allocation	DNA
		Local	Institutional	Differential	DNA
Minnesota	Comprehensive High Schools	Federal	Project	Negotiated	---
		State	Institutional	Variable	50
		Local	Institutional	Differential	50
	Cooperative Centers	Federal	Project	Negotiated	---
		State	Institutional	Variable	50
		Local	Institutional	Differential	50
	Area Voc-Tech Institutes	Federal	Institutional	Variable	10
		State	Institutional	Variable	80
		(Tuition)	Institutional	Differential	10
	Community Colleges	Federal	Supplemental	Variable	---
		State	Unit	Fixed	90
		(Tuition)	---	---	10
Mississippi	Comprehensive High Schools	Federal	Entitlement	Variable	DNA
		State	Unit/Supplemental	Variable	DNA
		Local	Institutional	Differential	DNA
	Vocational Centers	Federal	Unit	Variable	DNA
		State	Unit	Variable	DNA
		Local	Institutional	Differential	DNA
Missouri	Comprehensive High Schools	Federal	Unit	Mixed	[20]
		State	Unit	Mixed	
		Local	Institutional	Differential	80
	Area Vocational Centers.	Federal	Special/Unit	Mixed	[50]
		State	Special/Unit	Mixed	
		Localal	Institutional	Differential	50
	Junior Colleges	Federal	Unit	Fixed	[75]
		State	Salary	Variable	
		Local	Institutional	Differential	25[3]

[1]Refer to Table V-1.

[2]Refer to Table V-2.

[3]Includes tuition.

[4]Differential rates apply to general and vocational education programs.

DNA: Data not available. (Funding provisions do not permit meaningful and/or consistent presentation of aggregated summaries of source/cost share data.)

*Figures presented in "% of Cost" column refer to basic program costs. Where special project funding or supplemental funding provisions exist, the "Program Cost Allocation Unit" and "Cost Share Computation Basis" are identified with no data provided for "% of Cost."

DATA IN THIS TABLE SHOULD BE USED ONLY IN THE CONTEXT OF THE SUPPLEMENTARY NOTE PROVIDED ON PAGE 101.

Table V-3 (Continued)

Operating Cost Support Programs in Different States and Institutions*

State	Institution	Funding Source	Program Cost Allocation Unit[1]	Cost Share Computation[2]	% of Cost
Montana	Comprehensive High Schools	Federal	Program	Variable	1
		State	Ent./Unit	Fixed/Added	13
		Local	Institutional	Differential	6
	Voc-Tech Centers	Federal	Supplemental	Variable	15
		State	Institutional	Variable	80
		Local	Institutional	Differential	5
	Community Colleges	Federal	Program	Fixed	DNA
		State	Institutional	Differential	DNA
		Local	Institutional	(5)	DNA
Nebraska	Comprehensive High Schools	Federal	Entitlement	Variable	[16-27]
		State	Entitlement	Variable	
		Local	Institutional	Differential	73-84
	Technical Community Colleges	Federal	Entitlement	Variable	1
		State	Special	Negotiated	38
		Local	Institutional	Differential	61[3]
Nevada	Comprehensive High Schools	Federal	Program	Variable	10
		State	Supplemental	Variable	65
		Local	Institutional	Differential	25
	Area Vocational-Technical School	Federal	Program	Variable	10
		State	Supplemental	Differential	65
		Local	Institutional	Differential	25
	Community College	Federal	Project	Negotiated	5
		State	Institutional	Variable	90
		(Tuition)	---	---	5[3]
New Hampshire	Comprehensive High Schools	Federal	Entitlement	Variable	5
		State	Unit	Fixed/Variable	[95]
		Local	Institutional	(5)	
	Area Vocational Centers	Federal	Entitlement	Variable	5
		State	Unit	Fixed/Variable	[95]
		Local	Special	(5)	
	Vocational-Technical Colleges	Federal	Institutional	Negotiated	DNA
		State	Institutional	Negotiated	DNA
		Local	---	---	---
	Technical Institute	Federal	Institutional	Negotiated	DNA
		State	Institutional	Negotiated	DNA
		Local	---	---	---

[1]Refer to Table V-1.

[2]Refer to Table V-2.

[3]Includes tuition.

[4]Differential rates apply to general and vocational education programs.

[5]Fixed local tax effort.

DNA: Data not available. (Funding provisions do not permit meaningful and/or consistent presentation of aggregated summaries of source/cost share data.)

*Figures presented in "% of Cost" column refer to basic program costs. Where special project funding or supplemental funding provisions exist, the "Program Cost Allocation Unit" and "Cost Share Computation Basis" are identified with no data provided for "% of Cost."

DATA IN THIS TABLE SHOULD BE USED ONLY IN THE CONTEXT OF THE SUPPLEMENTARY NOTE PROVIDED ON PAGE 103.

Table V-3 (Continued)

Operating Cost Support Programs in Different States and Institutions*

State	Institution	Funding Source	Program Cost Allocation Unit[1]	Cost Share Computation[2]	% of Cost
New Jersey	Comprehensive High Schools	Federal	Entitlement	Variable	DNA
		State	Unit	Variable	DNA
		Local	Institutional	Differential	DNA
	Area Vocational-Technical Schools	Federal	Entitlement	Variable	DNA
		State	Unit	Variable	DNA
		Local	Institutional	Differential	DNA
	Community Colleges	Federal	Project	Negotiated	DNA
		State	Unit	Fixed	DNA
		Local	Institutional	Differential	DNA
New Mexico	Comprehensive High Schools	Federal	Entitlement	Variable	12
		State	Unit	Variable	[88]
		Local	Institutional	Differential (5)	
	Postsecondary Area Vocational Schools	Federal	Entitlement	Variable	25
		State	Unit	Variable	[75]
		Local	Institutional	Differential	
	Community and Junior Colleges	Federal	Entitlement	Variable	25
		State	Unit	Variable	[75]
		Local	Institutional	Differential	
New York	Comprehensive High School/ Vocational H.S.	Federal	---	---	---
		State	Program	Variable	30-90
		Local	Special	Differential	10-70
	BOCES	Federal	Project	Negotiated	DNA
		State	Program	Variable	DNA
		Local	Special	Differential	DNA
	Community Colleges	Federal	Project	Negotiated	---
		State	Institutional	Fixed	33 1/3-40
		Local	Special	Differential	60-66 2/3
	Agricultural & Technical Colleges	Federal	Project	Negotiated	---
		State	Institutional	Fixed	100[3]
		Local	---	---	---
North Carolina	Comprehensive High Schools	Federal	Entitlemental	Variable	[68-74]
		State	Unit	Variable	
		Local	Institutional	Differential	26-32
	Shared-Time Centers	Federal	Entitlement	Variable	[68-74]
		State	Unit	Variable	
		Local	Institutional	Differential	26-32
	Technical Institutes and Community Colleges	Federal	Project	Variable	---
		State	Unit	Fixed	79
		Local	Institutional	Differential	21[3]

[1]Refer to Table V-1.

[2]Refer to Table V-2.

[3]Includes tuition.

[4]Differential rates apply to general and vocational education programs.

[5]Fixed local tax effort.

DNA: Data not available. (Funding provisions do not permit meaningful and/or consistent presentation of aggregated summaries of source/cost share data.)

*Figures presented in "% of Cost" column refer to basic program costs. Where special project funding or supplemental funding provisions exist, the "Program Cost Allocation Unit" and "Cost Share Computation Basis" are identified with no data provided for "% of Cost."

DATA IN THIS TABLE SHOULD BE USED ONLY IN THE CONTEXT OF THE SUPPLEMENTARY NOTE PROVIDED ON PAGE 103.

Table V-3 (Continued)

Operating Cost Support Programs in Different States and Institutions*

State	Institution	Funding Source	Program Cost Allocation Unit[1]	Cost Share Computation[2]	% of Cost
North Dakota	Comprehensive High Schools	Federal	Entitlement	Variable	[40-60]
		State	Entitlement	Variable	
		Local	Institutional	Differential	40-60
	Vocational Centers	Federal	Entitlement	Variable	[40-60]
		State	Entitlement	Variable	
		Local	Institutional	Differential	40 60
	Junior Colleges	Federal	Program	Negotiated	DNA
		State	Program	Negotiated	DNA
		Local	Institutional	Differential	DNA
Ohio	Comprehensive High Schools	Federal	Project/Entit.	Variable	DNA
		State	Unit/Salary	Mixed	DNA
		Local	Institutional	(5)	DNA
	Joint Vocational School Districts	Federal	Project/Entit.	Variable	DNA
		State	Unit/Salary	Mixed	DNA
		Local	Institutional.	(5)	DNA
	Community Colleges	Federal	Unit	Variable	DNA
		State	Unit	Rate	DNA
		Local	Special	Differential	DNA
	Technical College	Federal	Unit	Variable	DNA
		State	Unit	Rate	DNA
		(Tuition)	---	---	---
	General & Technical Colleges	Federal	Unit	Variable	DNA
		State	Unit	Rate	DNA
		(Tuition)	---	---	---
Oklahoma	Comprehensive High Schools	Federal	DNA	DNA	DNA
		State	Unit	Fixed	DNA
		Local	Institutional	Differential	DNA
	Area Vocational-Technical Schools	Federal	Entit./Project	Mixed/Negot.	[50]
		State	Entitlement	Mixed	
		Local	Institutional	Differential	50
	Community and Junior Colleges	Federal	Special	Variable	DNA
		State	Instit/Program	Rate	80
		Local	Institutional	Differential	20[3]
	Technical Institutes	Federal	Special	Variable	DNA
		State	Instit/Program	Rate	80
		(Tuition)	---	---	20[3]
Oregon	Comprehensive High Schools	Federal	Entit./Project	Variable	5
		State	Special/Unit	Differential	32.5
		Local	Institutional	Differential	62.5
	Community Colleges	Federal	Entit./Project	Variable	4.5
		State	Institutional	Fixed	48.5
		Local	Institutional	Differential	48[3]

[1]Refer to Table V-1.

[2]Refer to Table V-2.

[3]Includes tuition.

[4]Differential rates apply to general and vocational education programs.

[5]Fixed local tax effort.

DNA: Data not available. (Funding provisions do not permit meaningful and/or consistent presentation of aggregated summaries of source/cost share data.)

*Figures presented in "% of Cost" column refer to basic program costs. Where special project funding or supplemental funding provisions exist, the "Program Cost Allocation Unit" and "Cost Share Computation Basis" are identified with no data provided for "% of Cost."

DATA IN THIS TABLE SHOULD BE USED ONLY IN THE CONTEXT OF THE SUPPLEMENTARY NOTE PROVIDED ON PAGE 103.

Table V-3

Operating Cost Support Programs in Different States and Institutions*

State	Institution	Funding Source	Program Cost Allocation Unit[1]	Cost Share Computation[2]	% of Cost
Pennsylvania	Comprehensive High Schools	Federal	Entit./Project	Variable	---
		State	Unit	Fixed	50
		Local	Institutional	Differential	50
	Vocational High Schools	Federal	Entit./Project	Variable	---
		State	Unit	Fixed	50
		Local	Institutional	Differential	50
	Area Vocational-Technical Schools	Federal	Entit./Project	Variable	---
		State	Unit	Fixed	50
		Local	Institutional	Differential	50
	Community Colleges	Federal	DNA	DNA	---
		State	Institutional	Negotiated	33
		Local	Institutional	Differential	67[3]
Rhode Island	Area Vocational Facilities	Federal	Entitlement	Variable	---
		State	Special	Variable	30-70
		Local	Institutional	Differential	30-70
	Junior College	Federal	---	---	---
		State	Institutional	Negotiated	84
		(Tuition)	---	---	16[3]
South Carolina	Comprehensive High Schools	Federal	Program	Variable	15
		State	Unit/Entit.	Variable	75
		Local	Institutional	Differential	10
	Area Vocational Centers	Federal	Entitlement	Variable	15
		State	Unit/Entit.	Variable	75
		Local	Institutional	Differential	10
	Technical Colleges	Federal	---	---	---
		State	Unit	Variable/Rate	73
		Local	Institutional	Differential	27[3]
South Dakota	Comprehensive High Schools	Federal	Salary	Variable	[25-45]
		State	Salary	Variable	
		Local	Institutional	Differential	55-75
	Multi-District Vocational Centers	Federal	Salary	Variable	[25-45]
		State	Salary	Variable	
		Local	Institutional	Differential	55-75
	Vocational-Technical Schools	Federal	Institutional	Mixed	[66-2/3]
		State	Institutional	Mixed/Negot.	
		Local	Institutional	Differential	33 1/3

[1]Refer to Table V-1.

[2]Refer to Table V-2.

[3]Includes tuition.

[4]Differential rates apply to general and vocational education programs.

DNA: Data not available. (Funding provisions do not permit meaningful and/or consistent presentation of aggregated summaries of source/cost share data.)

*Figures presented in "% of Cost" column refer to basic program costs. Where special project funding or supplemental funding provisions exist, the "Program Cost Allocation Unit" and "Cost Share Computation Basis" are identified with no data provided for "% of Cost."

DATA IN THIS TABLE SHOULD BE USED ONLY IN THE CONTEXT OF THE SUPPLEMENTARY NOTE PROVIDED ON PAGE 103.

Table V-3 (Continued)

Operating Cost Support Programs in Different States and Institutions*

State	Institution	Funding Source	Program Cost Allocation Unit[1]	Cost Share Computation[2]	% of Cost
Tennessee	Comprehensive High Schools	Federal	Project	Negotiated	---
		State	Program	Rate	90
		Local	Institutional	Differential	10
	Vocational Centers	Federal	Project	Negotiated	---
		State	Program	Rate	90
		Local	Institutional	Differential	10
	Area Vocational-Technical Schools	Federal	Entitlement	Variable	20
		State	Entit./Instit.	Mixed	80
		Local	---	---	---
	Technical Institutes	Federal	Program	Added Cost	9.5
		State	Institutional	Negotiated	78.0
		Tuition	---	---	12.5[3]
	Community Colleges	Federal	Program	Added Cost	9.4
		State	Institutional	Negotiated	85
		Tuition	---	---	5.6[3]
Texas	Comprehensive High Schools	Federal	Entit./Unit	Variable	20
		State	Unit	Mixed	50
		Local	Institutional	Differential (5)	30
	Area Vocational Schools	Federal	Entit./Unit	Variable	20
		State	Unit	Mixed	50
		Local	Institutional	Differential (5)	30
	Community (Junior) Colleges	Federal	DNA	DNA	60-65
		State	Institutional	Negotiated	
		Local	Institutional	Differential	35-40[3]
	Texas State Technical Institute	Federal	DNA	DNA	90
		State	Institutional	Negotiated	
		Tuition	---	---	10[3]
Utah	Comprehensive High Schools and (District) Area Vocational Centers	Federal	Entitlement	Variable	10-15
		State	Unit/Suppl.	Rate/Differential	[85-90]
		Local	Unit	(5)	
	Area Vocational Centers	Federal	Supplemental	Variable	25
		State	Institutional	Variable	75
		Local	---	---	---
	Technical Colleges	Federal	Unit	Variable	6
		State	Institutional	Negotiated	80
		Tuition	---	---	14[3]
	Two-Year Community Colleges	Federal	Unit	Variable	6
		State	Institutional	Negotiated	80
		Tuition	---	---	14[3]

[1]Refer to Table V-1.

[2]Refer to Table V-2.

[3]Includes tuition.

[4]Differential rates apply to general and vocational education programs.

[5]Fixed local tax effort.

DNA: Data not available. (Funding provisions do not permit meaningful and/or consistent presentation of aggregated summaries of source/cost share data.)

*Figures presented in "% of Cost" column refer to basic program costs. Where special project funding or supplemental funding provisions exist, the "Program Cost Allocation Unit" and "Cost Share Computation Basis" are identified with no data provided for "% of Cost."

DATA IN THIS TABLE SHOULD BE USED ONLY IN THE CONTEXT OF THE SUPPLEMENTARY NOTE PROVIDED ON PAGE 103.

Table V-3 (Continued)

Operating Cost Support Programs in Different States and Institutions*

State	Institution	Funding Source	Program Cost Allocation Unit[1]	Cost Share Computation[2]	% of Cost
Vermont	High School/ Area Centers	Federal	Entitlement	Variable	25
		State	Entit./Special	Variable	
		Local	Institutional	Differential	75
	Technical College	Federal	---	---	---
		State	Institutional	Negotiated	DNA
		Tuition	---	---	DNA
Virginia	Comprehensive High Schools	Federal	Project	Negotiated	DNA
		State	Unit/Supp.	Fixed	DNA
		Local	Institutional	Differential	DNA
	Area Vocational Centers	Federal	Project	Negotiated	DNA
		State	Unit/Supp.	Fixed	DNA
		Local	Institutional	Differential	DNA
	Community Colleges	Federal	Project	Negotiated	2
		State	Institutional	Negotiated	75
		Tuition	---	---	23[3]
Washington	Comprehensive High Schools	Federal	Entitlement	Variable	DNA
		State	Unit	Variable	DNA
		Local	Institutional	Differential	DNA
	Area Vocational-Technical Institutes	Federal	DNA	Variable	5
		State	Institutional	Negotiated	80
		Tuition	---	---	15[3]
	Community Colleges	Federal	DNA	DNA	100
		State	Institutional	Negotiated	
		Local	---	---	---
West Virginia	Comprehensive High Schools	Federal	Special	Variable	DNA
		State	Special	Variable	DNA
		Local	Institutional	Differential	DNA
	Area Vocational Centers	Federal	Special	Variable	DNA
		State	Special	Variable	DNA
		Local	Institutional	Differential	DNA
	Community Colleges	Federal	Entitlement	Variable	DNA
		State	Instit./Unit	Rate	DNA
		Local	---	---	---

[1]Refer to Table V-1.

[2]Refer to Table V-2.

[3]Includes tuition.

[4]Differential rates apply to general and vocational education programs.

DNA: Data not available. (Funding provisions do not permit meaningful and/or consistent presentation of aggregated summaries of source/cost share data.)

*Figures presented in "% of Cost" column refer to basic program costs. Where special project funding or supplemental funding provisions exist, the "Program Cost Allocation Unit" and "Cost Share Computation Basis" are identified with no data provided for "% of Cost."

DATA IN THIS TABLE SHOULD BE USED ONLY IN THE CONTEXT OF THE SUPPLEMENTARY NOTE PROVIDED ON PAGE 103.

Table V-3 (Continued)

Operating Cost Support Programs in Different States and Institutions*

State	Institution	Funding Source	Program Cost Allocation Unit[1]	Cost Share Computation[2]	% of Cost
Wisconsin	Comprehensive High Schools	Federal State Local	Entitlement Unit Institutional	Variable Variable Differential	DNA DNA DNA
	Vocational Centers	Federal State Local	Entitlement Unit Institutional	Variable Variable Differential	DNA DNA DNA
	Voc-Tech and Adult Education Districts	Federal State Local	Entit./Project Institutional Institutional	Negotiated Fixed/Variable Differential	5 35 60[3]
Wyoming	Comprehensive High Schools	Federal State Local	Suppl./Special Unit Unit	Variable Mixed Mixed (5)	1 46 53
	Community Colleges	Federal State Local	Suppl./Special Instit./Unit Institutional	Var./Negotiated Allocation Differential	1 48 51[3]
American Samoa	Comprehensive High Schools	Federal State Local	Project/Special Institutional ---	Negotiated Negotiated ---	--- 100 ---
	Vocational Skill Center	Federal State Local	Project/Special Institutional ---	Variable Negotiated ---	--- 100 ---
	Community College	Federal State Local	Project/Special Institutional ---	Variable Negotiated ---	--- 100 DNA
Guam	Vocational-Technical High School	Federal State Local	Unit/Project Inst./Unit ---	Negotiated Fixed ---	12 88 ---
	Community College	Federal State Local	Unit/Project Inst./Unit ---	Negotiated Fixed ---	--- 100 ---
Puerto Rico	Comprehensive High Schools	Federal State Local	Supplemental Institutional ---	Added Cost Negotiated ---	33-1/3 66-2/3 ---
	Postsecondary Vocational Technical Schools, et. al.	Federal State Local	Supplemental Institutional ---	Added Cost Negotiated ---	33-1/3 66-2/3 ---
	Technical Institutes	Federal State Local	Supplemental Institutional ---	Added Cost Negotiated ---	33-1/3 66-2/3 ---

[1]Refer to Table V-1.

[2]Refer to Table V-2.

[3]Includes tuition.

[4]Differential rates apply to general and vocational education programs.

[5]Fixed local tax effort.

DNA: Data not available. (Funding provisions do not permit meaningful and/or consistent presentation of aggregated summaries of source/cost share data.)

*Figures presented in "% of Cost" column refer to basic program costs. Where special project funding or supplemental funding provisions exist, the "Program Cost Allocation Unit" and "Cost Share Computation Basis" are identified with no data provided for "% of Cost."

DATA IN THIS TABLE SHOULD BE USED ONLY IN THE CONTEXT OF THE SUPPLEMENTARY NOTE PROVIDED ON PAGE 103.

Table V-3 (Continued)

Operating Cost Support Programs in Different States and Institutions*

State	Institution	Funding Source	Program Cost Allocation Unit[1]	Cost Share Computation[2]	% of Cost
Puerto Rico (Cont'd)	Agriculture School	Federal	Supplemental	Added Cost	33-1/3
		State	Institutional	Negotiated	66-2/3
		Local	---	---	---
	Special Vocational Center	Federal	Supplemental	Added Cost	33-1/3
		State	Institutional	Negotiated	66-2/3
		Local	---	---	---
	Tool and Die Making School	Federal	Supplemental	Added Cost	33-1/3
		State	Institutional	Negotiated	66-2/3
		Local	---	---	---
Trust Territory	Comprehensive High School	Federal	Supplemental	Negotiated	13
		State	Institutional	Negotiated	87
		Federal	---	---	---
	Postsecondary Institutions	Federal	Supplemental	Negotiated	5
		State	Institutional	Fixed	95
		Local	---	---	---
	Occupational Center	Federal	Supplemental	Negotiated	13
		State	Institutional	Negotiated	87
		Local	---	---	---
	Nursing School	Federal	Supplemental	Negotiated	5
		State	Institutional	Fixed	95
		Local	---	---	---
	Community College	Federal	Supplemental	Negotiated	5
		State	Institutional	Fixed	95
		Local	---	---	---
Virgin Islands	Comprehensive High School	Federal	Program	Negotiated	9
		State	Institutional	Negotiated	91
		Local	---	---	---
	College of the Virgin Islands	Federal	Program	Negotiated	DNA
		State	Institutional	Negotiated	DNA
		Local	---	---	---

[1]Refer to Table V-1.

[2]Refer to Table V-2.

[3]Includes tuition.

[4]Differential rates apply to general and vocational education programs.

DNA: Data not available. (Funding provisions do not permit meaningful and/or consistent presentation of aggregated summaries of source/cost share data.)

*Figures presented in "% of Cost" column refer to basic program costs. Where special project funding or supplemental funding provisions exist, the "Program Cost Allocation Unit" and "Cost Share Computation Basis" are identified with no data provided for "% of Cost."

DATA IN THIS TABLE SHOULD BE USED ONLY IN THE CONTEXT OF THE SUPPLEMENTARY NOTE PROVIDED ON PAGE 103.

PART II

DESCRIPTION OF VOCATIONAL EDUCATION INSTITUTION OPERATING CHARACTERISTICS AND FACILITY UTILIZATION

Just as a great diversity exists in the organizational structure of the vocational education systems of the individual States and Territories, (discussed in Part I), so, too, a great diversity exists in the characteristics of individual vocational education institutions.

The Office of Education regularly compiles information about program enrollments and vocational education expenditures. However, effective planning and policy formulation at the Federal level require more information about vocational education institutions than has previously been available. As a result, Federal legislation and policy have often been based on assumptions about the operating characteristics of vocational education institutions and delivery systems. While the findings of this study substantiate many of these assumptions, they also appear to refute many others or, at least, these findings suggest that these assumptions are neither wholly accurate nor as broadly applicable as once thought.

The following chapters describe the nation's vocational education delivery system in terms of the condition, accessibility, and utilization of its resources and its services. The data [and information] presented in these chapters are intended to provide a broad overview of the operating characteristics of institutions offering vocational education and to provide a data base that may be used in further studies of the effective use of the nation's vocational education resources. The presentation which follows is intended to meet the following three objectives:

- To describe the vocational education delivery system in terms of the size and distribution of the institutions that provide vocational education and the accessibility of these institutions to students.
- To assess the level of utilization of school-based vocational education facilities and the use of vocational education resources outside the schools.
- To describe institutional operating characteristics that influence the effective utilization of vocational education facilities.

These topics are discussed in three chapters whose contents are described below.

Chapter VI provides a description of the facility resources of the nation's vocational education systems. Included in this chapter are:

- An identification of the distribution of vocational education institutions in terms of their size (enrollments and vocational education shop, laboratory, and classroom resources), location, and the populations they serve.

- A documentation of the condition of institutions of different types serving different populations.

- A discussion of the adequacy of facilities in meeting the needs of physically handicapped students.

Chapter VII presents an analysis of the utilization of vocational education facilities.

Chapter VIII describes the operating characteristics of vocational education institutions in terms of the students they serve and characteristics of their admission programs and policies that influence their utilization.

While an extensive amount of data about institutions and their operating characteristics were collected in this study, the presentation contained in the following chapters has been limited to information meeting the following criteria:

- Information which addresses an issue of importance identified by the report of the General Accunting Office or by Office of Education personnel participating in this study.

- Information which provides insight into significant operational differences between institutional types or institutions in different types of regions -- e.g., urban, suburban, rural, etc.

- Information which has implications for related studies of the effectiveness on vocational education institutions in meeting the needs of different populations.

Study findings are only as accurate as the data secured. Inevitably, there is a potential for errors to be introduced by such factors as non-responses, the procedures employed in the conduct of the survey and the techniques applied to the analysis and presentation of data. The two most important of these factors are identified and their implications discussed below.

First, response rates for urban secondary schools -- especially comprehensive high schools -- were substantially lower than those for most other institutions and service-region types. Thus, tables in which data

are presented by institutional type do not necessarily present a complete picture for comprehensive high schools. Similarly, presentations based on service region type may be assumed to understate the case for secondary schools in urban areas.

Second, responses to all questions were not secured from all institutions. Non-responses are the result of two factors: (a) either the institution did not provide an answer; or, (b) because data were secured through a telephone interview based on a "key item" version of the mailed instrument, the question was not asked of the institution. Therefore, much of the data contained in the following tables are presented in percentages of institutions to which individual questions applied and/or institutions which responded to each question. No attempt has been made to estimate the extent to which answers supplied by respondent institutions actually reflect the population as a whole. However, in tables that report answers for subsets of the relevant populations, the portion of the population that provided answers is reported.

CHAPTER VI

VOCATIONAL EDUCATION FACILITY RESOURCES

Without adequate facilities it is impossible to offer adequate vocational education programs. The inclusion of construction as an authorized expenditure under the Vocational Education Act of 1963 was based on Congress' perception that sufficient facilities did not exist to meet the perceived demand for vocational education.

The passage of the Vocational Education Act of 1963 was followed by a substantial increase in facilities for vocational education -- so much so that construction was eliminated as an "encouraged" activity in the Vocational Education Act Amendments of 1968 and identified merely as a permissive category of Federal funds expenditure. By 1976, facility resources for vocational education had been expanded to the point that the need for additional facilities was being questioned by Congress. As a result, construction was relegated to a low priority category of expenditure under the provisions of the Education Amendments of 1976.

The perception of under utilization of existing facilities that was reflected in the funding provisions of the 1976 Amendments was verified by the findings of this study (see Chapter VII). However, this fact alone is an insufficient basis for the assumption that additional investments in facilities for vocational education are not required. Such an assumption can only[1] be substantiated through a demonstration that:

- Sufficient facilities are available in locations that will adequately serve the needs of students.
- Existing facilities are adequate in condition to effectively meet these needs.

The following topics present an analysis of the adequacy of existing vocational education facilities as measured by:

- The availability and accessibility of existing vocational education resources.
- The condition of existing facilities.

---

[1]Note: The analysis presented in this chapter is concerned solely with gross quantitative measures of facility resource availability relative to population distributions. As such it makes no effort to assess the impact of qualitative factors, such as community demand for vocational education and relative demands for manpower development. Such qualitative measures, however, should be considered in local estimates of facility adequacy.

- The adequacy of existing facilities in providing for physically handicapped students.

Availability and Accessibility of Vocational Education Resources

The degree to which vocational education programs and facility resources meet the demands of their identified service regions may be assessed in terms of the following measures:

- The distribution of vocational education institutions and instructional stations vis-a-vis the distribution of the population as a whole.

- The size of vocational education institutions -- as measured by total enrollments and number of vocational education shops, laboratories, and classroom resources made available to students in an individual institution or school system.

The following topics describe the nation's vocational education system in terms of these measures.

Distribution of Vocational Education Institutions and Instructional Stations by Type and Region Served

Table VI-1 summarizes the distribution of vocational education institutions by type and region served; Tables VI-2 and VI-3 present comparative summaries of the distribution of secondary and postsecondary

Table VI-1

Distribution of Schools by Type and Region Served

Institutional Type		Classification of Region Served							
		Cent. City Metro Area 500K+	Suburb Metro Area 500K+	Cent. City Metro Area 100-500K	Suburb Metro Area 100-500K	City or Town 25-100K	Regional Area 0-25K	Regional Area Other	Total[1]
Comprehensive High School	Single District	329	484	277	206	679	160	1,957	4,092
	Regional	34	47	29	20	83	31	178	422
Vocational High School	Single District	39	2	13	3	16	6	7	86
	Regional	21	4	12	14	22	42	16	131
Area Vocational Center	Single District	17	15	20	13	46	31	95	237
	Regional	13	45	17	21	112	235	149	592
Area Vocational School		12	12	22	5	55	105	49	260
Technical Institute		12	6	20	4	23	71	10	146
Community College		79	92	40	24	119	264	56	694

[1] Institutional totals (6,660) do not equal total survey responses (6,693) because some institutions did not respond to the classifying question used in the generation of this table.

institutions and instructional stations serving each region and contrast these distributions (expressed as percentages of the total number of institutions of each type) with an estimate of the distribution of the populations as a whole.[2]

As shown in Tables VI-2 and VI-3, when the distribution of institutions and instructional stations is compared to the distribution of the population as a whole, disproportionately high percentages of institutions (all types) and instructional stations are found in areas serving medium and small towns and rural communities -- i.e., areas having a population under 100,000. Specifically, while such regions account for only approximately 27 percent of the total population, approximately 60 percent of the secondary institutions and 68 percent of the postsecondary institutions -- providing respectively 61 and 66 percent of the secondary and postsecondary instructional stations -- are located in these areas.

This disproportion may be explained partially by the fact that the low population densities of non-urban areas require proportionally more institutions to provide programs within reasonable travel distances. However, this fact does not explain the proportionately higher percentage of the instructional stations also found in non-urban areas. As would be expected, individual institutions serving [these] medium and small towns and rural communities generally have fewer vocational education facilities than those in urban areas (Table VI-7). However, the great number of institutions serving these areas causes the overall distribution of instructional stations to be biased disproportionally toward non-urban areas.

The distributions of institutions and instructional stations depicted in Tables VI-2 and VI-3 are generally paralleled by the distribution of new construction projects and facility additions since 1965.

Tables VI-4 and VI-5 report the locations (defined by population type) where new facility construction and facility expansion has been undertaken between 1965 and 1976. These data show that a disproportionate percentage -- relative to population distributions reported in Tables VI-2 and VI-3 -- of all construction projects have occurred in areas having populations under 100,000.

---

[2] In interpreting data presented in these tables, it is important to note that institutions are reported by the type of region in which they are located and not by the size of the school district or political jurisdiction they serve. Thus, a town/school district of 3,000 which is a suburb of New York would be reported in the column headed "Suburb Metro Area 500K+" and not identified as serving a "Regional Area 0-25K." Similarly, the estimates of population distribution presented in Tables VI-2 and VI-3 reflect population location and not town or school district population. This distribution is important in assessing the construction of vocational education facilities in suburban areas because of its implications for local ability to provide construction revenues.

Table VI-2

Distribution of Institutions and Instructional Stations in Secondary Schools vs. Population

Population Region Type	Institutions		Stations[1]	Population
	Number	Percent	Percent	Percent
A. Central City, Metropolitan Population over 500,000	453	8.1	10.6	22.8
B. Suburb, Metropolitan Population over 500,000	597	10.7	13.5	38.0
C. Central City, Metropolitan Population 100-500,000	368	6.6	8.2	8.9
D. Suburb, Metropolitan Population 100-500,000	277	5.0	6.1	3.6
E. City or Town Population 25-100,000	958	17.3	21.4	3.1
F. Town or Region Population 0-25,000	2,402	43.2	34.5	23.6
G. Service Area not Elsewhere Classified	505	9.1	5.7	NA
Total[2]	5,560	100.0	100.0	100.0

[1]Instructional stations.

[2]Institutional totals (6,660) do not equal total survey responses (6,693) because some institutions did not respond to the classifying question used in the generation of this table.

Table VI-3

Distribution of Institutions and Instructional Stations in Postsecondary Schools vs. Population

Population Region Type	Institutions		Stations[1]	Population
	Number	Percent	Percent	Percent
A. Central City, Metropolitan Population over 500,000	103	9.3	13.3	22.8
B. Suburb, Metropolitan Population over 500,000	110	10.0	10.5	38.0
C. Central City, Metropolitan Population 100-500,000	102	9.3	17.1	8.9
D. Suburb, Metropolitan Population 100-500,000	33	3.1	2.9	3.6
E. City or Town Population 25-100,000	197	17.8	15.5	3.1
F. Town or Region Population 0-25,000	115	10.5	6.7	23.6
G. Service Area not Elsewhere Classified	440	40.0	34.0	NA
Total[2]	1,100	100.0	100.0	100.0

[1]Instructional stations.

[2]Institutional totals (6,660) do not equal total survey responses (6,693) because some institutions did not respond to the classifying question used in the generation of this table.

Table VI-4

New Facility Construction and Additions from 1965 thru 1976
-Secondary-

Population Region Type	Number of Projects	Percent of New Projects	Number of Institutions	Percent of Total Institutions
A. Central City, Metropolitan Population over 500,000	83	4.3	72	4.6
B. Suburb, Metropolitan Population over 500,000	201	10.4	159	10.1
C. Central City, Metropolitan Population 100-500,000	147	7.6	108	6.9
D. Suburb, Metropolitan Population 00-500,000	105	5.4	84	5.6
E. City or Town Population 25-100,000	371	19.2	299	19.1
F. Town or Region Population 0-25,000	702	36.3	597	38.0
G. Service Region Not Elsewhere Classified	325	16.8	248	15.7
Total	1,934	100.0	1,567	100.0

Table VI-5

New Facility Construction and Additions from 1965 thru 1976
-Postsecondary-

Population Region Type	Number of Projects	Percent of New Projects	Number of Institutions	Percent of Total Institutions
A. Central City, Metropolitan Population over 500,000	81	6.7	42	6.9
B. Suburb, Metropolitan Population over 500,000	107	8.8	54	8.9
C. Central City, Metropolitan Population 100-500,000	114	9.4	53	8.9
D. Suburb, Metropolitan Population 100-500,000	34	2.8	17	2.8
E. City or Town Population 25-100,000	232	19.2	120	19.5
F. Town or Region Population 0-25,000	118	9.7	54	8.9
G. Service Region [illegible] Elsewhere Classified	530	43.4	270	44.1
Total	1,216	100.0	610	100.0

This finding may be explained by the relatively lower cost of land and construction in non-urban areas and, possibly, by a greater ability or willingness of these populations to finance new school construction. In addition, some State agencies indicated that a higher priority was initially assigned to new projects in these areas because, when facility expansion programs were initially formulated, these areas had virtually no vocational education facilities, while the urban areas generally had at least a nominal capacity to provide vocational education.

A further factor accounting for the disproportion in the data presented in Tables VI-2 through VI-5 is the impact of Regional Commission and Economic Development Act funds. Such funds are generally most available for projects including vocational education facility construction in rural areas.

In interpreting the data presented in Tables VI-1 through VI-5, it should be recognized that the response rate from secondary schools in large urban areas was noticeably below the response rate for other institutions and service regions. Therefore, the proportional distributions of secondary schools in urban areas, as presented in these tables, understate the extent of vocational education offerings in urban areas. It is unlikely, however, that this error exceeded 25 percent of the institutions affected -- an error that translates into a potential increase of approximately two (2) percent of the large urban area share of institutions and instructional stations.[3]

In the absence of data that suggest what population to institution ratio is most adequate or desirable, it is not possible to conclude from these data whether urban needs for vocational education have not been met or whether facility expansion in non-urban areas has been excessive. This issue clearly requires further examination.

Institutional Size Distribution -- Facilities and Enrollments

The Vocational Education Act of 1963 and all subsequent amendments to this Act require that, to be designated an "area vocational education school" and qualify for receipt of Vocational Education Act funds, the institution so identified must offer five or more vocational education programs.

The choice of the number "five" as the minimum number of vocational programs needed to qualify for designation as an "area vocational education school" was a compromise between the arguments of two factions: those who felt that a substantially larger number of programs would be needed to provide a student with a true diversity of career choice options; and those who wished

[3] In the absence of accurate information on sub-population sizes, it has not been possible to estimate response rates by regional service strata or to apply corrective weights to responses.

to set the required number of programs low enough to make it feasible for small schools to establish the number of programs required to qualify for the receipt of Federal vocational education funds.

For purposes of this study, the legislative intent of the Vocational Education Act of 1963 was interpreted as a requirement for a minimum diversity on program offerings. Based on this criterion and an interpretation of legislative intent, this study was limited to institutions having five or more shops, laboratories, or classroom facilities for at least five different programs. The application of this definition means that institutions offering five or more instructional programs in fewer than five facilities, or in more than five facilities but less than five different facilities, were not included in this study.[4]

Table VI-6 shows the distribution of institutions surveyed by type of institution and number of vocational education shops, laboratories, and classrooms in each; Table VI-7 identifies the average number of shop, laboratory, and classroom facilities in institutions of each type serving different types of regions.

As seen in these tables, for all institutions included in this study the average number of vocational education facility resources for all types of institutions and institutions serving all service regions substantially exceeds the minimum requirements.

Further insight into the roles of different institutional types in providing vocational education is provided in the distribution of institutions by vocational education enrollments presented in Table VI-8. Data presented in Table VI-8 show that almost 35 percent of all institutions surveyed report vocational education enrollments of less than two hundred vocational students -- the number of students required to fully utilize five (5) 20-station instructional facilities two sessions per day. In fact, the median institution has an enrollment of under four hundred vocational education enrollments. (The median postsecondary institution has a vocational education enrollment slightly in excess of 1,000 students, while for secondary institutions, the median institution has a vocational education enrollment slightly over 300 students.)

[4]An institution might offer more than five instructional programs (titles) in one shop, laboratory, or classroom facility or might have five facilities of which two or more are for the same program. Such institutions were not included in this survey or were eliminated from the data base on which the tables presented in this chapter are based.

Table VI-6

Distribution of Vocational Education Shops, Laboratories, and Classrooms by Institutional Type

Institutional Type		Number of Shops and Laboratories																	
		5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16-20	21-25	26-30	31-35	36-40	40+	Average
Comprehensive High School	Single District	137	159	192	184	215	229	223	211	238	241	226	772	410	199	67	31	52	15.29
	Regional	16	17	12	14	30	16	23	25	22	30	25	87	38	27	12	8	11	16.53
Vocational High School	Single District	0	1	2	0	3	5	1	7	2	1	5	16	16	7	5	4	10	23.63
	Regional	3	0	0	4	2	4	3	5	2	5	5	28	14	15	15	11	20	26.56
Area Vocational Center	Single District	10	8	9	16	13	14	11	17	8	12	8	55	26	10	8	5	5	16.18
	Regional	16	22	24	22	30	27	31	16	24	20	35	113	79	54	29	12	31	18.92
Area Vocational School		3	3	6	8	9	4	9	10	10	10	7	39	25	29	26	14	48	28.51
Technical Institute		0	2	2	3	2	2	6	0	1	4	5	31	16	24	9	9	25	30.85
Community College		17	14	15	15	13	14	29	19	15	17	32	93	80	66	68	35	141	27.92
Total[1]		202	226	262	266	317	315	336	310	322	340	348	1234	704	431	239	129	343	18.36

[1] Institutional totals (6,660) do not equal total survey responses (6,693) because some institutions did not respond to the classifying question used in the generation of this table.

Table VI-7

Average Number of Shops/Laboratories by Institutional Type and Population Service Region

Institutional Type		Classification of Service Region							
		Cent. City Metro Area 500K+	Suburb Metro Area 500K+	Cent. City Metro Area 100-500K	Suburb Metro Area 100-500K	City or Town 25-100K	Regional Area 0-25K	Regional Area Other	Weighted Average
Comprehensive High School	Single District	18.6	17.6	17.7	17.1	18.3	12.5	13.9	15.29
	Regional	22.6	17.8	18.1	12.2*	18.0	14.4	17.8	16.53
Vocational High School	Single District	24.8	42.0*	29.8	36.7*	17.3	14.0*	19.0*	23.63
	Regional	26.1	52.0*	26.6	28.5*	24.2	17.8	25.4	26.56
Area Vocational Center	Single District	21.1	21.4	19.9	14.8*	16.9	13.1	16.5	16.18
	Regional	23.4	24.1	29.1	28.3	21.3	14.2	18.0	18.92
Area Vocational School		55.4*	48.1*	40.2	28.2	28.9	20.5*	24.3	28.51
Technical Institute		42.9	50.8*	37.4	20.8*	22.4	20.1	30.6	30.85
Community College		41.6*	28.4	35.9	30.7	26.1	17.1	24.9	27.92

*Data are based on ten or fewer institutions. Unusual conditions relating to one or more institutions may have anomalistic effect on the data presented.

Table VI-8

Distribution of Day Program Enrollments
by Institutional Type

Institutional Type		Size (approximate annual enrollments)														
		0-100	101-200	201-300	301-400	401-500	501-750	751-1000	1001-1250	1251-1500	1501-2000	2001-2500	2501-3000	3001-4000	4000+	Total[1]
Comprehensive High School	Single District	1,601	396	306	230	212	371	272	173	134	178	118	56	29	19	4,095
	Regional	109	46	39	36	31	49	39	18	16	19	6	5	3	7	423
Vocational High School	Single District	3	6	3	8	11	6	10	12	9	8	3	3	1	3	86
	Regional	7	3	5	7	10	24	33	12	10	12	10	2	0	2	137
Area Vocational Center	Single District	2	27	37	38	27	51	27	16	4	4	2	0	0	3	238
	Regional	6	45	100	83	60	110	82	41	33	24	3	5	0	2	594
Area Vocational School		5	24	18	36	27	49	39	12	15	11	5	6	6	9	262
Technical Institute		7	8	10	11	8	21	18	12	10	10	7	8	7	9	146
Community College		31	31	33	44	21	59	68	46	58	60	33	36	46	128	694
Total[1]		1,771	586	551	493	407	740	588	342	289	326	187	121	92	182	6,675

[1]Institutional totals (6,675) do not equal total survey responses (6,693) because some institutions did not respond to the classifying question used in the generation of this table.

Since the median secondary school has a minimum capacity[5] of over 550 students in vocational education and the median postsecondary institution has a capacity[5] in excess of 1,900 stations, a significant underutilization of resources appears to exist. (This fact is supported by data presented in Chapter VII.)

Condition of Vocational Education Facilities

Table VI-9 summarizes the reported condition of institutions[6] serving each of seven types of population service region.

From this Table it may be determined that 62.8 percent of all secondary institutions and 70.6 percent of postsecondary institutions report being in good condition. However, in the central cities of urban areas over 100,000, 37.5 percent of the secondary schools and 18.8 percent of the postsecondary institutions report that they are in need of minor maintenance, and 21.6 percent of the secondary schools and 16.4 percent of the postsecondary institutions report that they are in need of major maintenance or replacement.

[5]Median capacities indicated in the above discussion are estimates based on data relating to most probable program distributions and institutional operating characteristics.

[6]Table VI-9 contains responses from only approximately 60 percent of the institutions responding. However, no evidence exists to suggest that institutions not responding to the question on which this table is based would differ from responding institutions. Therefore, an estimate of the actual number of institutions in each category could be estimated based on these data and data contained in Table VI-1.

Table VI-9

Reported Condition of Institutions
By Numbers and Percents (In Parentheses) of Institutions Reporting

Population Region Type	Institutional Type		Reported Condition: In Good Condition	In Need of Minor Maintenance	In Need of Major Maintenance	In Need of Replacement	Total Institutions Responding
NATIONAL SUMMARY	Comprehensive High School	Single District	1,289 (59)	620 (29)	158 (7)	106 (5)	2,173
		Regional	153 (65)	59 (25)	15 (7)	9 (4)	236
	Vocational High School	Single District	30 (48)	16 (25)	7 (11)	10 (16)	63
		Regional	70 (75)	12 (13)	6 (6)	5 (5)	93
	Area Vocational Center	Single District	142 (75)	26 (14)	16 (8)	5 (3)	189
		Regional	334 (73)	91 (20)	9 (2)	25 (5)	459
	Area Vocational School		123 (68)	38 (21)	15 (9)	6 (3)	182
	Technical Institute		77 (63)	22 (18)	12 (10)	12 (10)	123
	Community College		344 (74)	71 (15)	19 (5)	31 (7)	465
Total			2,562 (64)	955 (24)	257 (7)	209 (5)	3,983
Central City Metropolitan Population over 500K	Comprehensive High School	Single District	63 (34)	82 (44)	26 (14)	15 (8)	186
		Regional	4 (27)	6 (40)	4 (27)	1 (7)	15
	Vocational High School	Single District	7 (23)	10 (33)	5 (17)	8 (27)	30
		Regional	2 (13)	6 (40)	4 (27)	3 (20)	15
	Area Vocational Center	Single District	12 (75)	1 (7)	3 (19)	0	16
		Regional	6 (86)	0	0	1 (14)	7
	Area Vocational School		1 (25)	2 (50)	1 (25)	0	4
	Technical Institute		5 (71)	1 (14)	5 (71)	1 (14)	7
	Community College		21 (57)	9 (24)	0	2 (5)	37
Suburb Metropolitan Population over 500K	Comprehensive High School	Single District	159 (59)	87 (32)	18 (6)	5 (2)	269
		Regional	18 (60)	7 (23)	4 (13)	1 (3)	30
	Vocational High School	Single District	2 (100)	0	0	0	2
		Regional	4 (100)	0	0	0	4
	Area Vocational Center	Single District	12 (86)	1 (7)	0	1 (7)	14
		Regional	23 (61)	11 (29)	2 (5)	2 (5)	38
	Area Vocational School		8 (80)	1 (10)	1 (10)	0	10
	Technical Institute		5 (83)	5 (83)	0	0	6
	Community College		50 (83)	1 (2)	4 (7)	1 (2)	60
Central City Metropolitan Population 100-500K	Comprehensive High School	Single District	69 (50)	48 (35)	18 (13)	4 (3)	139
		Regional	7 (50)	5 (36)	1 (7)	1 (7)	14
	Vocational High School	Single District	5 (50)	3 (30)	1 (10)	1 (10)	10
		Regional	6 (86)	1 (14)	0	0	7
	Area Vocational Center	Single District	6 (46)	5 (38)	0	2 (15)	13
		Regional	4 (31)	6 (46)	0	3 (23)	13
	Area Vocational School		4 (40)	3 (30)	3 (30)	0	10
	Technical Institute		9 (75)	2 (17)	0	1 (8)	12
	Community College		32 (80)	3 (8)	3 (8)	2 (5)	40

Table VI-9 (Continued)

Reported Condition of Institutions
By Numbers and Percents (In Parentheses) of Institutions Reporting

Population Region Type	Institutional Type		Reported Condition: In Good Condition	In Need of Minor Maintenance	In Need of Major Maintenance	In Need of Replacement	Total Institutions Responding
Suburb Metropolitan Population 100-500K	Comprehensive High School	Single District	88 (63)	48 (34)	3 (2)	2 (1)	141
		Regional	11 (69)	1 (6)	2 (13)	2 (13)	16
	Vocational High School	Single District	2 (100)	0	0	0	2
		Regional	12 (100)	0	0	0	12
	Area Vocational Center	Single District	12 (92)	1 (8)	0	0	13
		Regional	14 (82)	1 (6)	2 (12)	0	17
	Area Vocational School		1 (50)	0	1 (50)	0	2
	Technical Institute		3 (100)	2 (67)	0	0	3
	Community College		7 (64)	0	1 (9)	1 (9)	11
Urban/Suburban Metropolitan Population 25-100K	Comprehensive High School	Single District	231 (61)	101 (27)	30 (8)	17 (4)	379
		Regional	26 (68)	7 (18)	2 (5)	3 (8)	38
	Vocational High School	Single District	7 (64)	2 (18)	1 (9)	1 (9)	11
		Regional	12 (86)	1 (7)	1 (7)	0	14
	Area Vocational Center	Single District	30 (86)	1 (3)	3 (9)	1 (3)	35
		Regional	61 (74)	17 (21)	1 (1)	3 (4)	82
	Area Vocational School		25 (71)	6 (17)	3 (9)	1 (3)	35
	Technical Institute		11 (73)	3 (20)	0	1 (7)	15
	Community College		55 (71)	15 (19)	2 (3)	5 (6)	77
Town or School District Population 0-25K	Comprehensive High School	Single District	640 (61)	239 (23)	61 (6)	62 (6)	1,052
		Regional	77 (73)	26 (25)	2 (2)	1 (1)	106
	Vocational High School	Single District	5 (83)	1 (17)	0	0	6
		Regional	8 (73)	2 (18)	0	1 (9)	11
	Area Vocational Center	Single District	60 (78)	12 (16)	4 (5)	1 (1)	77
		Regional	89 (74)	22 (18)	3 (2)	7 (6)	121
	Area Vocational School		24 (75)	7 (22)	1 (3)	0	32
	Technical Institute		7 (78)	0	2 (22)	0	9
	Community College		29 (83)	1 (3)	2 (6)	3 (9)	35
Regional Service Area (NEC)	Comprehensive High School	Single District	39 (68)	15 (26)	2 (4)	1 (2)	57
		Regional	10 (56)	7 (39)	0	1 (6)	18
	Vocational High School	Single District	2 (100)	0	0	0	2
		Regional	26 (87)	2 (7)	1 (3)	1 (3)	30
	Area Vocational Center	Single District	19 (70)	5 (19)	3 (11)	0	27
		Regional	137 (74)	34 (18)	8 (4)	6 (3)	185
	Area Vocational School		60 (67)	19 (21)	6 (7)	5 (6)	90
	Technical Institute		37 (62)	9 (15)	5 (8)	9 (15)	60
	Community College		150 (69)	42 (19)	7 (3)	17 (8)	216

While no attempt has been made to standardize the value scale of "condition" reported in this table, it is clear that a substantial need exists for facilities renovation and replacement.

Adequacy of Facilities in Serving Physically Handicapped Students

Since the enactment of the Vocational Education Act of 1963, responding to the needs of physically handicapped students has been a significant priority of Federal legislation. While physical handicaps are only one class of handicap needing to be recognized in vocational education planning, how facilities are designed with provisions to accommodate handicapped students can have a significant impact on the effectiveness with which these students can be served.

Table VI-10 presents a summary of the reported accessibility of vocational education facilities to handicapped students. This table shows that access to vocational education programs by physically handicapped students is significantly constrained by the inadequacy of facilities to serve these students. This limitation becomes all the more striking when one recognizes that the "some" facilities accessible to students with physical handicaps are generally not shop and laboratory facilities in the Technical and Trade and Industry programs that offer the highest financial returns to students. One should also note that -- based on an examination of unreported raw data -- the majority of the institutions reporting limited or no access for students with physical handicaps are predominantly older facilities and facilities located in urban areas.

Table VI-10

Accessibility of Vocational Facilities To Students with Physical Handicaps

Institutional Type		Portion of Vocational Education Facilities Accessible to Handicapped Students: All No.	All %	Some No.	Some %	None No.	None %	Institutions Reporting	Percent of Institution (By Type) Reporting
Comprehensive High School	Single District	553	24.7	1,146	51.3	537	24.1	2,236	54.5
	Regional	71	29.6	117	48.7	52	21.7	240	56.8
Vocational High School	Single District	7	11.2	26	41.9	29	46.8	62	71.3
	Regional	41	41.2	28	28.3	30	30.3	99	72.3
Area Vocational Center	Single District	84	42.8	81	41.3	31	13.8	196	79.7
	Regional	210	45.2	199	42.8	56	12.0	465	78.3
Area Vocational School		83	44.6	88	47.3	15	8.1	186	71.0
Technical Institutes		41	36.3	62	54.9	10	8.8	113	77.4
Community College		200	42.1	254	53.4	21	44.2	475	68.4

CHAPTER VII

THE UTILIZATION OF VOCATIONAL EDUCATION FACILITY RESOURCES

Recent studies have raised questions concerning the extent to which vocational education agencies make efficient use of available facilities. Measurement of the "effective utilization" of facilities is not an easy matter, however, since the term "effective" suggests a variety of measures -- some of which reflect subjective judgments of program goals and objectives -- and the term "utilization" may be defined in more than one way.

For purposes of this study, the utilization of available vocational education facilities is assessed in terms of:

- The use of school based facilities.
- The use of community resources by the vocational education program.

The following topics examine these two aspects of facility utilization.

Utilization of School Based Facilities

The utilization of school based vocational education facility resources may be measured in terms of at least the following three major variables:

- The utilization of available instructional stations during the regular day program offered by different types of institutions.
- The operating hours of institutions.
- The use of facilities during "alternate" operating schedules: extended day schedules, evenings, Saturdays, summers, etc.

These uses of vocational education facilities as measured by these variables are discussed in the following topics.

Station Utilization During Regular Day Program

Table VII-2 reports the average level of utilization of instructional stations during the regular day sessions offered by different institutional types serving different service areas.

Before attempting to interpret this table, however, it is necessary to understand the basis on which these data were derived and to recognize the limitations of the original data used in these computations.

The data presented in Table VII-2 is based on the formula:

$$U = \frac{E}{\sum_{i=1}^{m} C_i n_i f_i} \quad [100]$$

where: U = total utilization (expressed as a percent)

E = total number of students served daily by all vocational shops, laboratories or classrooms

n_i = number of shops, laboratories or classrooms for program i

C_i = total capacity (in stations) per shop, laboratory or classroom of type i

$(C_i n_i)$ = total instructional stations in institution

f_i = number of class sessions in facility i per day ("f" is computed as the total daily operating hours of institution ÷ hours per class session).

m = number of programs at the school

In using the formula presented above, values of E, n_i, and C_i were used as reported by respondents to this survey. Daily operating hours for each institution -- which are used in the computation of "f_i" -- are also derived from data provided by the respondents.

The "hours per class session" used in the computation of "f_i" are based on "normal" class durations for different programs in different institutions as presented in Table VII-1 on the next page.

Table VII-1

Hours Per Class Session

Program Area	Type of Institution	
	Secondary	Postsecondary
Agriculture	2	3
Home Economics	2	3
Distributive Educ.	2	2
Health	2	3
Business and Office	1.5	1.5
Technical/Trade & Ind.	3	3

The validity of the findings presented in Table VII-2 is affected by the following factors.

In determining the number of facilities for each program, respondents were asked to report the number of "shop, laboratory, or classrooms" used for each program. While a separate reporting cell was provided for the identification of "related classrooms," some respondents included these spaces in the number of "shops, laboratories, or classrooms" available for each program. However, because students are in either the related classroom or the "shop/laboratory," the inclusion of these facilities as vocational instructional stations in the utilization capacity computations reduces the computed level of utilization. A "spot check" of respondents indicated that this was not a common problem and no corrective action was taken. However, this problem must be accommodated in any further use of the reported [study] data.

A potentially more significant problem has been identified in review of enrollment data "E" in the utilization computation formula. This problem results from two factors.

First, because of the potential problem of respondent burden (and its impact on response rates), respondents were asked to estimate the number of students served by each facility on a daily basis rather than to spend excessive time collecting records to secure exact data.

A second potential problem appears to have been introduced by institutions that reported on the total enrollments in programs using each facility and not [on] the number of students served by each facility on a daily basis. In secondary schools and in postsecondary institutions in which students are

Table VII-2

Estimated Average Level of Utilization (in Percent) by Institutional Type and Service Region Types

School Type		Classification of Region Served							
		Central City Over 500 K	Suburb Over 500 K	Central City 100 - 500 K	Suburb 100 - 500 K	Urban/ Suburb 25 - 100 K	Town/ District 0 - 25 K	Regional Service Area	Weighted Average
Comprehensive High School	Single District	85.5	*	90.9	91.0	92.9	88.5	79.5	86.6
	Regional	87.4	77.1	97.3	76.4	84.3	78.5	77.1	80.6
Vocational High School	Single District	80.0	50.5	61.6	59.9	57.9	45.0	73.2	69.0
	Regional	70.1	65.6	66.4	63.4	63.2	54.7	45.5	59.4
Area Vocational Center	Single District	98.8	68.3	60.9	81.2	68.0	84.0	62.0	69.8
	Regional	47.8	66.2	76.4	75.4	63.9	68.6	59.1	65.1
Area Vocational School		54.1	58.3	47.9	52.6	44.5	41.5	45.6	45.4
Technical Institute		48.9	60.4	46.5	82.7	52.6	42.4	38.1	46.4
Community College		70.4	63.5	59.5	78.1	48.5	43.7	37.9	52.2

*Use of formula resulted in computation of utilization rate over 100 percent (102.9%).

scheduled into a single laboratory on a daily basis, this problem does not appear to be significant. However, in institutions such as community colleges in which students receive a portion of their practical experience in multiple facilities or on an intermittent schedule -- such as a three-day-a-week laboratory schedule -- this problem may lead to errors, since it results in the computation of a utilization rate that is higher than the actual utilization rate.

Finally, the values for "hours per class session" (shown in Table VII-1) are based on estimates of what appear to be the most common average figures for each class of secondary or postsecondary institutions. However, these figures do not apply uniformly to all institutions of each type, may vary substantially between States, and may even vary for institutions within each State -- particularly comprehensive high schools.

An examination of the utilization rates computed using these data suggests that there are substantial State and institutional differences that introduce great variance into the distribution of assumed average operating hours.

The utilization rates reported in Table VII-2 do not reflect conditions that are consistent with the experience of the program specialists associated with this study. Therefore, readers are cautioned to use the data only in the context of the assumptions represented by data in Table VII-1.

(Note: It is the belief of the study review panel that the major source of error in the procedures applied to this analysis is to be found in the great diversity of "hours per class session" applicable to different courses in different institutions. Therefore, it is recommended that further analysis of these data begin with a detailed examination of this variable.)

Operating Hours

Further insight into the utilization of vocational education facilities is provided by information relating to institutional operating hours. Table VII-3 summarizes the operating hours of different types of institutions and institutions serving different types of populations.

Table VII-3

Average Hours of Daily Utilization
(By School, By Type, and Region Served)

Institution Type		Classification of Region Served							
		Central City Over 500 K	Suburb Over 500 K	Central City 100 - 500 K	Suburb 100 - 500 K	Urban/ Suburb 25 - 100 K	Town/ District 0 - 25 K	Regional Service Area	Total
Comprehensive High School	Single District	7.9	7.9	7.6	7.9	7.9	7.6	7.5	
	Regional	7.6	8.4	8.0	8.5	8.2	7.7	8.3	
Vocational High School	Single District	8.5	9.8	10.0	8.9	8.8	8.1	7.25	
	Regional	9.2	11.2	9.8	10.6	8.9	8.6	10.1	
Area Vocational Center	Single District	10.2	10.0	8.9	9.4	9.3	9.2	9.0	
	Regional	8.7	10.6	9.5	11.2	9.8	9.4	12.4	
Area Vocational School		9.0	12.8	9.5	8.9	10.6	10.0	11.1	
Technical Institute		10.6	13.2	11.8	13.4	11.4	11.9	12.3	
Community College		11.2	12.3	12.1	10.7	11.6	10.7	11.5	

As shown in Table VII-3, postsecondary institutions generally operate substantially longer hours than secondary institutions. However, even those institutions do not operate lengths of days that would generally be regarded as the most effective use of their physical resources.

Furthermore, secondary institutions of all types serving regional populations have higher average hours of operation than similar institutions serving single school districts. This fact, combined with the fact that area vocational centers and regional vocational high schools have longer average operating hours than comprehensive and vocational high schools, is an interesting contrast with the lower levels of facility utilization reported in Table VII-2 for area vocational centers and regional vocational high schools.

Use of Facilities on Alternate Schedules

Further information about the operating hours of various institutions is provided in Table VII-4 which includes a summary of the numbers and percentages of institutions reporting the offering of extended day, evening, Saturday, and summer programs.

Table VII-4

Use of School Facilities for Extended Day, Evening, Saturday, and Summer Sessions

Institution Type		Schedule/Session Operated			
		Extended Day[1] %	Evening[2] %	Saturday %	Summer %
Comprehensive High School	Single District	48.2	76.7	45.0	67.2
	Regional	52.1	83.6	48.0	67.8
Vocational High School	Single District	42.7	81.7	34.6	49.4
	Regional	59.4	96.4	43.1	65.4
Area Vocational Center	Single District	36.2	91.4	28.7	57.0
	Regional	41.6	93.4	34.2	55.2
Area Vocational School		60.5	98.9	46.0	90.9
Technical Institute		60.3	99.3	52.1	98.6
Community College		75.0	99.6	70.1	98.6

[1] EXTENDED DAY, AFTERNOON SESSION: An afternoon program offered after the regular day session has ended, but before six o'clock in the evening and serving different types of students by offering programs which differ from the regular day program.

[2] EVENING PROGRAM: As designated by this institution. If no local definition exists, "evening program" will mean a program of instruction offered after six o'clock in the afternoon.

As shown in Table VII-4, less than half (47%) the secondary schools (weighted average) and approximately 76 percent of the postsecondary institutions offer "extended day" programs (as defined), while approximately 77 percent of the secondary schools and 99 percent of the postsecondary institutions operate evening programs.

In addition to information on the frequency of extended day and evening programs, Table VII-4 reports [on] the frequency with which institutions of each type offer vocational education courses on Saturdays and during the summer. As shown in this table, less than half of the secondary schools (43%) and approximately 69 percent of the postsecondary institutions offer Saturday classes. Further, 60 percent of the secondary institutions and 96 percent of the postsecondary institutions offer summer programs.

Shared Resource Programs

A second measure of the utilization of available facility resources is the extent to which such agencies share resources with other agencies. The following topics discuss two aspects of facility resource sharing:

- The sharing of resources between educational agencies.

- The sharing of resources by public and non-public education agencies including: (a) the use of non-public school resources by public educational agencies; and (b) the use of public school resources by non-public education agencies.

Resource Sharing Between Educational Agencies

Tables VII-5, 6, and 7 [respectively] summarize the frequency with which educational agencies engage in programs of shared resources with other educational agencies. These programs of resource sharing are discussed in the following paragraphs.

As shown in Table VII-5, a significant portion of both the comprehensive high schools and vocational high schools surveyed report participating in exchange programs with a (another) comprehensive high school. While many of these programs are structured regional vocational education programs that represent important components of the vocational education systems in their respective States, many have been determined to be ad hoc programs developed on an informal basis to provide students with access to programs not offered in their home high schools.

Table VII-5 also shows that over 50 percent of the comprehensive high schools surveyed and almost 25 percent of the vocational high schools are in regions served by a (another) vocational high school or an area vocational center. Of these schools, over 25 percent of the comprehensive high schools and four percent of the vocational high schools share students with an area vocational center. In addition, approximately seven percent (weighted average)[1] of the comprehensive and vocational high schools engage in exchange programs with a (another) vocational high school.

As shown by data presented in Table VII-6, there exist a substantial number of programs under which secondary schools and secondary school students use the facilities of or are served by postsecondary institutions. Of the approximately 38 percent (weighted average) of the secondary schools reporting that are located in an area served by a postsecondary institution, approximately 10 percent (weighted average) report using the facilities of such postsecondary institutions for their vocational education programs. Nineteen percent (weighted average) report that their students are served by vocational education programs in these postsecondary institutions.

---

[1] Weighted average = $\frac{\text{Number of Institutions (by type)} \times \text{Average Response Percent (by institutional type)}}{\text{Total Institutions}}$

Table VII-5

Sharing of Resources Between Secondary Schools

Institutional Type		Institution With Which Resources Are Shared				
		Comprehensive High School	Served by a Vocational School/Center		Vocational High School	Area Vocational Center
		%T [1]	No. [2]	%L [3]	%	%
Comprehensive High School	Single District	19.8	2,077	51.9	6.0	29.9
	Regional	63.7	177	64.6	11.4	24.2
Vocational High School	Single District	29.2	19 [4]	24.4 [4]	7.3	3.7
	Regional	32.3	* [4]	* [4]	3.0	4.2

[1] %T = Percent of total institutions (by type) which share vocational education resources with a comprehensive high school.

[2] No. = Number of institutions (by type) located in a region served by a (another) Vocational High School or Area Vocational Center

[3] %L = Percent of total institutions (by type) located in a region served by a (another) Vocational High School or Area Vocational Center

[4] * = None of the 137 institutions reporting responded to the relevant question.

Table VII-6

Use of Facilities in Postsecondary Institutions by Secondary Schools/Student

Institutional Type		Form of Use of Postsecondary Institutions			
		Served		High Schools Use Facilities in Postsecondary Institutions	High School Students Take Shop Courses at Postsecondary Institutions
		No. [1]	% [2]	% [3]	%
Comprehensive High School	Single District	1,325	38.8	9.6	20.7 [4]
	Regional	132	41.3	12.2	25.6 [4]
Vocational High School	Single District	18	23.7	3.9	10.4
	Regional	35	33.0	7.5	7.5
Area Vocational Center	Single District	53	30.3	7.4	6.9
	Regional	165	39.9	11.1	10.0

[1] No. = Number of institutions reporting (by type) which are located in regions served by postsecondary institutions.

[2] % = Percent of institutions (by type), located in regions served by postsecondary institutions, which use the resources of those institutions.

[3] % = Percent of institutions (by type), located in regions served by postsecondary institutions, which engage in the practice described.

[4] NOTE: Thirty-four percent of all postsecondary institutions responding reported serving secondary school students.

Table VII-7

Use of Secondary and Other Postsecondary School Facilities by Postsecondary Institutions

Institutional Type	Students Take Vocational Education Courses at a Secondary School %	Students Take Vocational Education Courses at a Postsecondary Institution %
Area Vocational School	2.7	4.6
Technical Institute	7.5	7.5
Community College	11.4	16.3

Table VII-7, however, suggests that the inverse of this condition is not generally true since less than 10 percent (weighted average) of the postsecondary institutions report using, or being served by, resources in secondary schools. Significantly, the least frequent use of secondary school resources by postsecondary institutions is reported by area vocational schools, followed by technical institutes and community colleges. Overall, approximately 35 percent of the postsecondary institutions report receiving services from secondary schools.

Shared Resource Between Public and Non-Public Educational Agencies

The vocational education programs and facility resources found in public schools make up only one segment of the nation's manpower development capacity. Much concern has been expressed about both the limited use of training resources outside of their institutions by vocational education institutions and the limited access to public vocational education facilities by other training agencies. Therefore, an effort was made to determine the frequency with which vocational education institutions use training resources in institutions external to the public education system and to determine the frequency with which vocational education facilities in public educational institutions are used by non-educational agencies.

Table VII-8 provides estimates of the percentages of institutions of various types that use the training resources of education and training agencies outside the public education system.

Table VII-8

Use of Non-Educational Facilities By Educational Agencies

Institutional Type		Alternative Resources Used				
		Percent of Institutions Reporting	CETA Skill Centers	Job Corps Centers	Private, Non-Profit Training Facilities	Armories or Military Bases
Comprehensive High School	Single District	63.2	12.4	2.8	11.3	4.4
	Regional	73.0	7.6	1.2	11.8	2.9
Vocational High School	Single District	61.8	11.9	2.4	14.3	7.1
	Regional	68.1	7.8	1.6	14.1	7.8
Area Vocational Center	Single District	76.8	14.4	0.0	11.5	2.2
	Regional	80.7	9.4	0.3	6.9	3.9
Area Vocational School		85.3	15.2	1.3	12.6	6.6
Technical Institute		83.8	10.8	0.0	20.4	7.5
Community College		90.7	12.2	1.5	19.7	18.3

As shown in Table VII-8, public schools generally do not make extensive use of non-public educational resources. The extent to which schools

use non-public resources for their vocational education programs is substantially greater than has generally been assumed -- especially with the use of proprietary school resources and manpower programs.

Equally as important as the use of non-public school education resources by the public schools is the use of public school resources by non-public school agencies. Table VII-9 provides an estimate of the percentage of institutions, by type, whose vocational education resources are used by non-educational agencies.

Table VII-9

Use of Educational Facilities By Non-Public School Institutions and Other Agencies

Institutional Type		Use of Institutional Resources						
		Percent of Institutions Reporting	Manpower Programs (CETA, etc.)	Trade Union Training Programs	Industrial Training Programs	Community Action Agencies	Correctional Institutions	Adult Programs[1]
Comprehensive High School	Single District	49.6	21.7	9.3	14.5	12.2	21.6	48.6
	Regional	50.4	31.0	11.3	18.3	13.1	5.6	54.5
Vocational High School	Single District	68.6	44.1	44.9	37.3	15.3	6.8	44.1
	Regional	65.0	71.9	57.3	69.7	35.0	10.1	30.3
Area Vocational Center	Single District	73.1	45.4	27.0	46.0	22.4	6.3	47.1
	Regional	72.7	64.8	40.0	57.4	31.7	13.7	51.4
Area Vocational School		64.9	81.8	59.4	70.0	42.4	27.6	47.6
Technical Institute		75.3	70.9	38.2	71.8	48.1	25.6	46.4
Community College		62.1	75.6	40.6	51.9	42.9	25.5	49.2

[1] Not administered by the vocational education department of the school.

As shown in this table, substantially more institutions providing vocational education are used by external agencies than use external resources for their own programs. Postsecondary institutions are used by agencies outside the public school system relatively more frequently than secondary schools. There are, however, several instances in which secondary schools provide services to external agencies with the same or greater frequency than postsecondary institutions. Because of the relatively lower rate of response to the question from which is derived data presented in Table VII-9, observations based on these data should be regarded as inferences and not treated as complete representations of reality. (One important consideration relating to these data is that it is unclear from available data whether the hours during which vocational education facilities are used by agencies identified in Table VII-9 are included in the schedules reported in Table VII-3 or represent additional utilization of public resources.)

Use of Alternate Facilities for Vocational Education

Traditionally, educational programs operated by public educational systems have been almost exclusively offered in facilities that are under the direct control of the public schools. Increasingly, however, vocational education programs are making use of other sources of training facilities or are developing vocational education programs in facilities initially designed for other purposes. These "alternate" sources of facilities may be generally classified as follows:

- Use of rental and leased facilities.
- Use of facilities initially built for other purposes but which have been purchased and converted for vocational education.

The extent to which such alternatives are used is discussed in the following sections.

Use of Rental and Leased Facilities

Table VII-10 reports the percentage of each type of institutions serving each type of "population service region" that are now using rented or leased facilities for a portion of their vocational education program.[2]

Table VII-10

Consideration and Use of Rental and/or Leased Facilities (Percent)

Institutional Type		Used	Considered But Not Used	Not Considered
Comprehensive High School	Single District	7.7	18.5	73.8
	Regional	11.5	22.3	63.6
Vocational High School	Single District	13.3	10.0	76.7
	Regional	19.2	13.2	67.6
Area Vocational Center	Single District	5.8	8.7	85.5
	Regional	20.0	19.6	60.4
Area Vocational School		33.6	15.8	50.6
Technical Institute		51.1	13.4	35.5
Community College		50.1	15.8	34.1

[2]Since this study made no effort to identify either the specific types of facilities which are rented and/or leased, the capacity of such facilities, or the programs for which they are used, the following discussion is limited to an assessment of the magnitude and potential significance of such programs.

As shown in Table VII-10, rented and leased facilities are considered and used as a source of facilities for vocational education more frequently by postsecondary institutions than by secondary schools. While this difference may be largely attributed to differences in contracting provisions applying to different types of educational systems, this fact does not account for the significant differences that exist in the consideration and use of rented and leased facilities by single district and regional secondary schools. As shown, these regional secondary schools consider and use rented and leased facilities with significantly greater frequency than the single district schools. This difference may be explained by the greater latitude provided these schools by the more permissive -- often "special" -- legislation under which they have been established. Available data are insufficient to verify this assumption.

Discussions with vocational educators suggest that rented and/or leased facilities are generally viewed as temporary space to be used for the following purposes:

- The temporary housing of a program while permanent facilities are being constructed.
- The offering of programs for which a short term demand exists but for which the long term demand is insufficient to justify permanent incorporation of the program and facility into the institution's total curricula.
- The offering of a program on a "test" basis to determine the long-term demand before planning new facilities.

However, there are also many institutions whose total vocational education program is housed permanently in rented and leased facilities. Also, some educational systems have policies that maximize the use of "external" facilities through facility lease and rental as an alternative to new construction.

Purchase and Conversion of Non-Educational Facilities

The high cost -- and long time delays -- associated with new construction has led many educational institutions to acquire facilities through the purchase and conversion of existing facilities. Tables VII-11 and VII-12 summarize the frequency with which secondary and postsecondary institutions consider acquiring and/or using facilities acquired through rent/lease or purchase and conversion of facilities.

Approximately 47 percent of all institutions reported the conversion of existing school facilities for their vocational education programs; an estimated 11 percent of secondary institutions and 26 percent of postsecondary institutions have engaged in the purchase and conversion of facilities not the

original property of their respective educational systems. An additional 34 percent of the secondary schools and 18 percent of the postsecondary institutions reported that consideration was given to the conversion of existing facilities. Approximately 40 percent of all institutions reported that consideration was given to the purchase and conversion of facilities not the original property of the school system.

Table VII-11

Consideration and Use of the Conversion of an Existing Facility that Was Already the Property of the School System

Institutional Type		Used	Considered But Not Used	Not Considered
Comprehensive High School	Single District	47.6	33.9	18.5
	Regional	52.3	32.3	15.4
Vocational High School	Single District	58.8	35.3	21.3
	Regional	22.2	22.2	55.6
Area Vocational Center	Single District	39.3	47.5	13.2
	Regional	31.1	31.7	37.2
Area Vocational School		38.0	27.0	35.0
Technical Institute		55.9	18.6	25.5
Community College		46.3	16.7	37.0

Table VII-12

Consideration and Use of the Purchase and Conversion of a New Facility

Institutional Type		Used	Considered But Not Used	Not Considered
Comprehensive High School	Single District	10.1	40.0	49.9
	Regional	13.8	43.0	33.2
Vocational High School	Single District	11.8	35.3	33.9
	Regional	23.0	41.7	35.3
Area Vocational Center	Single District	11.5	39.3	49.2
	Regional	18.6	50.9	31.5
Area Vocational School		17.0	45 0	38.0
Technical Institute		30.5	39.0	31.5
Community College		26.8	38.9	34.3

CHAPTER VIII

PROGRAM OFFERINGS AND ADMISSION CHARACTERISTICS OF VOCATIONAL EDUCATION INSTITUTIONS

In the development of this study, it was hypothesized that the level of facility utilization of a vocational education institution could be correlated with institutional operating characteristics that relate to the level of instructional programs offered by the institution. In addition, it has been hypothesized that this level of utilization could be correlated with characteristics of institutional admission criteria and with schedules on which students may be admitted to the institution. The following sections summarize the levels of instruction provided in different types of institutions and provide the criteria and schedules on which students are admitted to vocational education programs.

Institutional Program Levels Offered

While discussions presented in Chapter VI treated secondary and postsecondary institutions independently, both "secondary" and "postsecondary" institutions operate a variety of programs that serve "other" students.

Table VIII-1 summarizes the distribution of institutional types in terms of the population types they serve. As shown in this table, a substantial number of institutions of all types -- 49.8 percent of the secondary institutions and 95.3 percent of the postsecondary institutions -- provide services to students other than those who represent the primary clientele of the institution.[1]

No attempt has been made to correlate the level of programs offered to population service region types; yet these data suggest that more programs

[1] In interpreting these tables the reader should be aware that some questions exist as to the consistency of the definitions applied to the terms "postsecondary" and "adult." The glossary of terms included in each survey instrument provided definitions of these terms. A review of these data suggests that many respondents distinguished between these classifications based on a definition of postsecondary programs as any program of study other than upgrading (defined as adult) offered to students at the post-high school level -- rather than the definition of "postsecondary" as a degree-granting program. This potential data error was identified through a random comparison of data provided by respondents with institutional data supplied by State agencies. However, in the absence of an intensive followup, it is difficult to estimate the magnitude of these classification errors.

Table VIII-1

Distribution of Levels of Program Offered By Type of Institution

Institutional Type		Level of Program Offered						
		Secondary Only	Post-secondary Only	Secondary and Adult	Secondary and Post-secondary	Secondary/ Post-secondary and Adult	Post-secondary and Adult	Total
Comprehensive High School	Single District	2,437	0	1,379	36	237	0	4,089
	Regional	184	0	194	3	41	0	422
Vocational High School	Single District	30	0	35	2	18	0	85
	Regional	11	0	76	5	45	0	137
Area Vocational Center	Single District	45	0	133	1	56	0	235
	Regional	62	0	323	7	201	0	593
Area Vocational School		1	7	19	0	136	99	262
Technical Institute		0	7	1	1	26	111	146
Community College		0	38	0	10	231	415	694
Total[1]		2,770	52	2,160	65	991	625	6,663

[1]Institutional totals (6,663) do not equal total survey response (6,693) because some institutions did not respond to the classifying question used in the generation of this table.

may be available at each level of instruction than would be assumed based on the data presented in Tables VI-2 and VI-3.

No attempt has been made to assess the magnitude of services to "other" students provided by institutions reporting -- for example, the size of the postsecondary student population served by the 36 comprehensive high schools reporting the offering of programs for postsecondary students. However, these data do suggest the existence of major efforts on the part of all types of institutions to provide services to an extended population.[2]

In examining the data presented in Table VIII-1, it should be noted that many legislative provisions, State agency policies, and agreements between State agencies restrict the levels of instructional programs offered

[2]The definitions provided in the survey instrument were:

ADULT: Program of vocational education for persons who have completed or left high school and who are not described in the definition of "post-secondary program," or who have already entered the labor market, or who are unemployed. Adult programs do not earn credit toward an associate degree or transfer credit towards a baccalaureate degree.

POST-SECONDARY: Program of vocational education for persons who have completed or left high school and who are enrolled in organized programs of study for which credit is given toward an associate or other degree, but which is not designated as a baccalaureate or higher degree program.

by various types of institutions. Therefore, the presence or absence of instructional programs for student populations other than those traditionally identified with each type of institution must be regarded as a function of both local and State agency factors. (Since a detailed study of the factors affecting program levels offered was not included in this study, there is no data base that would provide a basis for explaining the distribution of services -- program level offerings -- identified in Table VIII-1.)

Admission Criteria and Schedules

The efficient utilization of vocational education facilities and resources, and the degree to which vocational education programs are able to adequately serve the needs of their intended target populations, is significantly affected by their admissions criteria and schedules of student entry into courses and programs.

Data that provide insight into these factors are presented and discussed in the following sections.

Admission Criteria

The question on which the greatest debate occurs, and on which the greatest misunderstandings about vocational education exist, is, "Who should be served by vocational education?"

Not many years ago, vocational education was generally regarded as the dumping ground for students who "could not make it" in academic programs -- and this concept is still held by many today. At that time, and to a lesser extent today, vocational education was the educational systems' response to the needs of students who could not, or most likely would not, go to college. The idea of a vocational education program in school systems serving middle and upper class neighborhoods was virtually unheard of. Vocational education was for someone else's children.

Now, however, vocational education institutions serve even the wealthiest communities, and competition for admission to these institutions may result in as many as two, three, or more applicants for each available slot. As a result, many institutions have begun applying selective admission criteria and screening procedures that limit access to vocational education programs. In the absence of a specific policy statement relating to the question, "Who should be served by vocational education?", it is not possible to assess the impact of such criteria or the achievement of the objectives held for this system; nor is it possible, for reasons cited in earlier discussions, to isolate the impact that such criteria may have on levels of facility utilization. Therefore, the following data are intended solely to identify the existence and distribution of different admissions criteria.

Table VIII-2 identifies the percentage of institutions of each type that apply different admissions criteria. As shown in this table,

Table VIII-2

Vocational Education Program Admission Criteria
Applied by Different Classes of Institutions
(Percent of Institutions Reporting)

Institutional Type		Admissions Criteria					
		None	High School Diploma	Screening Test	Interview	Demonstration of Ability	Age
Comprehensive High School	Single District	21.0	NA	15.9	41.0	32.6	26.7
	Regional	15.5	NA	25.5	60.5	42.7	49.1
Vocational High School	Single District	8.6	NA	58.6	67.2	48.3	46.6
	Regional	4.5	NA	51.1	69.3	58.0	54.5
Area Vocational Center	Single District	3.0	NA	40.0	72.1	51.5	60.6
	Regional	9.0	NA	35.5	57.8	47.5	67.1
Area Vocational School		0.6	44.2	52.9	79.7	64.0	84.3
Technical Institute		1.0	72.5	57.8	67.0	57.8	69.7
Community College		3.2	70.2	48.3	60.7	49.2	56.9

approximately 80 percent of all comprehensive high schools, 90 percent of all vocational high schools and area vocational centers, and over 97 percent of all postsecondary institutions have established criteria for the acceptance of students into their vocational education programs.

While this observation is not surprising, it is interesting to note the relatively low frequency of interviewing and testing, alone or in combination, as an admission criterion. Examination of raw data used in the generation of this table reveals that 90 percent of the institutions reporting the use of screening tests also require an interview for admission, while only 48 percent of the institutions reporting the use of interviews also administer a screening test.

Furthermore, more single district vocational high schools and area vocational centers (both single district and regional) require screening tests than require a "demonstration of ability to succeed." This observation suggests that in these institutions and in others, screening tests may be used as a "creaming" device that restricts access to less able students independent of their ability to succeed in the vocational education program of their choice. (Available data are insufficient to test this hypothesis and further study is clearly warranted.)

Table VIII-2 also indicates that substantial differences exist in the admission criteria used by different types of postsecondary institutions. As shown, area vocational schools apply the criteria of age and demonstration of ability more frequently than either technical institutes or community colleges. Yet they require a high school diploma less frequently than all types of postsecondary institutions. This observation is particularly

interesting when viewed in the context of Table VII-2 which shows area vocational schools to have the lowest (weighted average) level of utilization of all types of postsecondary institutions.

Admission Schedules

Inevitably, students will drop out of a program. While student dropouts during a term or school year are perhaps less of a problem in secondary schools than in postsecondary institutions, it is a common occurrence in all types of institutions. Because dropouts result in unused learning stations, the overall level of utilization of facilities and instructional resources is reduced if provisions do not exist that allow other students desiring entrance to the program to do so at any time.

Table VIII-3 summarizes the distribution of program entry schedule provisions of different types of institutions. As shown in this table, most institutions have provisions for the entry of new students at times other than the beginning of the school year. Most importantly, of the secondary institutions, 54.3 percent permit secondary students to enter at times other than the beginning of the school year and 21.4 percent allow students to enter vocational education programs at times other than the beginning of a term. Similarly, 66.0 percent of the postsecondary institutions allow postsecondary program enrollees to begin at times other than the beginning of the school year with 18.3 percent permitting entry at times other than the beginning of a term. Significantly, 47 percent of the postsecondary institutions providing for student entry at any "time during a term" are area vocational schools.

Table VIII-3

Admission Schedules
(By Percent of Institutions
Offering Levels Identified)

Institutional Type	Program Level	Students Can Begin/Transfer In		
		Beginning of a School Year	Beginning of a Term	Any Time During the Year
Secondary Schools	Secondary	45.7	32.9	21.4
	Postsecondary	35.6	33.3	31.1
	Adult	22.0	51.5	26.5
Postsecondary Schools	Secondary	34.0	47.7	18.3
	Postsecondary	26.2	48.5	25.3
	Adult	19.1	46.3	34.6

In addition to the general scheduling provisions discussed above, a special class of scheduling problem exists in institutions which provide vocational education programs for workers in manufacturing areas where shift work is common. Since shift workers are not able to attend class on a regular schedule, special scheduling provisions must be made. The response to this problem is found in "parallel scheduling."

"Parallel scheduling" is the practice of offering the same course multiple times during the day to enable shift workers to receive a continuous program of instruction on a schedule that is consistent with their changing schedule of availability. Obviously, such a scheduling program can only be implemented in institutions having a sufficiently large student base to justify multiple sessions of the same course; yet only through such provisions can the needs of shift workers be met. This requirement for a large student pool in a single institution can generally be met only when a minimum duplication of programs exists in the institutions serving a region, i.e., all students are "funneled" into one institution.

Data secured from institutions surveyed suggest that less than 10 percent of the secondary institutions providing postsecondary and adult vocational education programs and only 51 percent of the postsecondary institutions offer parallel schedules. It was found that only 32 percent of these programs are found in institutions serving metropolitan areas of over 100,000.

PART III

PLANNING ACTIVITIES OF STATE AND LOCAL AGENCIES

Good planning is undeniably essential to the effective operation of any enterprise. Good planning, however, does not inherently result in an effective program because there are many variables that affect the degree to which the outcome of a planning process can be effectively implemented. In practice, the best planning accounts for the influence of extraneous variables that are likely to affect the plan's implementation and results in a viable solution to the current problem. Since the "ideal plan" is almost never implementable, the best planning almost invariably results in a sub-optimal plan -- imperfect but workable.

The study by the General Accounting Office posed a major challenge to the notion that the development of State vocational education systems have been "well planned." However, the GAO report's criticism of the planning activities undertaken by State and local education agencies was based more on an (implied) comparison of present planning practices with a theoretical model of what should be occurring rather than an assessment of the effectiveness of the planning process per se.

The effective planning of vocational education institutions and programs is shaped by many factors whose accommodation often has a significant impact on the outcome of the planning activity. Factors that have been observed to have a significant impact on the planning of vocational education institutions and program range from the provisions of legislation and policy -- which may predefine the alternatives which may be considered by the planners -- to differences in the real and perceived objectives of the planning activity and political, fiscal, and legal factors. These factors range from the potential community acceptability of alternative plans to the projected availability of capital and operating funds and the provisions of teacher contracts -- all of which affect the scope of the planning activity.

Because the factors identified above do have a significant impact on the effectiveness of a planning activity, it is impossible to assess the quality of planning in terms of the activities that should be undertaken in an "ideal" planning endeavor. Similarly, it is impossible to assess the quality of current planning in terms of the outcomes of the planning process because of constraints imposed by the external variables identified above on the viability of alternative outcomes.

The problem of assessing the quality of vocational education planning is further complicated by the conditions that affect the present operation of a vocational education institution or program -- the only characteristics which can be measured -- and which are not generally the conditions that existed when the institution or program was being planned. Therefore, these characteristics cannot be used to measure the quality of planning activities.

Measures such as the level of facility utilization and the cost per placement are often discussed as measures of the effectiveness of vocational education planning activities. The use of such measures, however, assumes that the objectives of vocational education planners can be assessed in terms of the management planning and decision-making processes applied by profit-making organizations. In spite of the manpower orientation of Federal legislation and of most vocational education agencies, the use of "placements" and "response to manpower demand" cannot be used as a measure of planning effectiveness because they fail to accommodate the fact that vocational education is as much a social program as a manpower training activity. Further, since the majority of the funds for vocational education programs are local funds -- or funds that are ultimately under the discretionary control of local authorities -- it is the "local objectives," rather than the State and Federal objectives, that dictate the goals of and set limitations on planning activities.

The GAO report was particularly critical of the fact that State agencies rely on local agencies "to determine local needs, establish local priorities, and plan and conduct their own programs." Under present conditions in most States, State agencies can do little to effectively implement their plans because most of the funds required for the implementation of such plans are restricted by the formula requirement and maintenance of effort requirements of the Federal law and by the existing funding provisions and policies that exist within States. Specifically, the formula funding requirement dictates where Federal funds go, while the maintenance-of-effort provision restricts the States' ability to alter radically their allocation and distribution procedures.

The introduction of provisions that would "improve" the process of planning requires at least two conditions:

- First, if the planning of vocational education is to be improved by legislation and/or policy introduced at the State or Federal level, it is necessary to: (a) define specific objectives whose achievement is to be sought by vocational education planners, and (b) to establish measures that may be used in the evaluation of progress towards these goals. In essence, this requirement implies the formalization of a national manpower policy and the identification of the role of vocational education in meeting the objectives of this policy.

- Second, provisions must be made for States' agencies to have latitude to implement provisions which enable them to distribute funds in accordance with a plan whose development is not constrained by factors such as the "matching" and maintenance-of-effort provisions of Federal legislation.

The implementation of specific policies and procedures for the improvement of planning also requires an understanding of the objectives of and limitations imposed on planning activities as they are undertaken at the State and local levels.

The following chapter is intended to provide a basis on which such policies and procedures may be developed by:

- Identifying the factors that have significant impacts on the planning activities of State and local education agencies and which constrain the effectiveness of planning activities.

- Describing the planning activities of local agencies in terms of the major factors that are considered in the process of program planning.

CHAPTER IX

FACILITY AND PROGRAM PLANNING PRACTICES

The effectiveness of a planning activity is determined both by what is done and how well it is done. Since this study was intended primarily to identify what is done in the process of program and facility planning, the following topics discuss only reported planning practices and the factors that affect the decision-making process. No attempt has been made to evaluate the quality of planning activities undertaken by State and local education agencies or to determine the validity of factors that have been reported as the basis for decision-making.

The following chapter is intended to answer two questions:

- How are new facilities and vocational education programs planned?
- What are the factors that affect the planning and decision-making process and influence the efficient use of vocational education facilities and resources?

Planning Processes and Priorities

The following sections discuss the data used in program and facility planning and the priorities assigned to factors in the planning and decision-making process.

Because planning for the efficient use of vocational education facilities and resources is an ongoing process, the following topics discuss activities that occur in both the initial planning of vocational education facilities and the ongoing process of program review.

Planning Data Requirements And Use

Three of the most important requirements for an effective vocational education program are:

- The existence of jobs for which students are being prepared.
- The existence of students who desire to pursue the educational program being offered in preparation for available jobs.
- Programs that represent a cost-effective use of resources.

The first of these requirements is critical, because, if the institution offers programs for which there is no placement potential, they will not be serving the students and will be inappropriately committing resources that could be better spent for other programs. The second characteristic is important because resources expended on facilities and programs are only used efficiently if a sufficient number of students enroll in a program to represent a cost-effective use of such resources. The third of these requirements is essential if the most effective use of resources is to be made of vocational education investments.

Local education agencies clearly recognize the importance of at least the first of these factors. As reported in Table IX-1, local manpower projections are uniformly identified as the highest priority factor used in the selection of programs.

Table IX-1

Priority[1] of Factors Used in Program Selection and Facility Planning

Factor	Comprehensive High Schools	Vocational High Schools	Area Vocational Centers	Area Vocational Schools	Technical Institutes	Community Colleges
Local Manpower Projections	3.41	2.41	2.43	2.41	2.57	2.48
State Manpower Projections	4.90	3.60	3.94	3.53	4.61	4.06
National Manpower Projections	6.31	5.95	6.18	6.22	6.74	6.18
Programs Most Often Requested by Students	2.21	3.86	2.99	4.05	3.45	3.81
Programs Most Often Requested by Community	3.18	4.08	3.39	3.60	2.92	2.94
Recommendation of State Agency	4.84	5.11	4.92	5.09	5.80	5.51
Requests from Industry and Labor Organizations	5.17	3.68	3.98	3.39	2.86	3.64
Recommendation of Consultants	5.51	5.87	6.42	6.25	7.08	7.06
Facility and Equipment Costs of Programs	5.09	5.96	6.31	6.69	5.51	5.56
Operating Costs of Programs	5.73	6.69	7.19	7.35	6.12	5.89

[1] Reporting scale: 1 = highest priority; 10 = lowest priority.

The significance of manpower projections and placement estimates in the process of new facility planning also suggests several important questions.

While all State agencies reported that estimates on manpower demand are required for program and/or facility funding approval, 22.1 percent of

the institutions reported that no formal manpower survey was conducted in the planning of their facilities. This fact suggests that many institutions rely on existing manpower data for their planning. However, because manpower planning regions normally do not correspond to the regions that institutions identify as their "local" manpower response service area, it is difficult to evaluate how effectively these data can be used in identifying the "local manpower need" that is identified as the highest priority planning factor.

While all State agency respondents indicated that manpower data were required in a program and/or facility funding application, only one reported that programs were disapproved for failure to demonstrate adequate demand. Most frequently, program demand was "evaluated jointly" by State agency staffs and local authorities. Only 17.6 percent of all respondents, however, reported that their State agencies participated in their manpower study. Furthermore, the recommendations of State agencies were relatively low priority factors used in selecting programs for new facilities.

In understanding the use of manpower data as a planning and program selection factor, it is also essential to note the difference between total manpower demand and unmet manpower demand. Unmet demand is the difference between total demand and the trained manpower supplied from other sources. This demand should provide the basis for program planning. Theoretically, the determination of unmet manpower demand should be based on data relating to the output of both other training programs responding to the same labor market need and the manpower need that is met by the immigration of trained workers. In practice, however, it is generally practical to account for only the former source of supply. Only one State reported that a documentation of other facility resources and programs serving a region was required in their facility planning application.

Tables IX-2 and IX-3 summarize the percents of secondary and postsecondary respondents who reported that information on the (a) availability and (b) capacity of other manpower training sources was sought in the identification of manpower demand. As shown in these tables, a substantially higher percentage of postsecondary than secondary institutions reported that information was sought on the availability and capacity of other vocational education programs when planning their own facilities.

In order to avoid the unnecessary duplication of existing programs, several States have implemented program review requirements for examining programs proposed by institutions. While such reviews are generally limited to institutions at a single level, several States require program proposal reviews by agencies responsible for other educational systems before program approval. In most instances, however, interagency review applies only to review of programs funded with Vocational Education Act funds in institutions that are under the authority of another agency. Even this review is most frequently limited to the review of the program per se and does not include an evaluation of the need for the program in the overall vocational education "system" of the region being served.

Table IX-2

Alternative Sources of Vocational Resources
Considered in Identifying Program Need
(Percent of Institutions Responding)
-Secondary Schools-

Vocational Education and Training Resources	Information Was Sought On		Program and Capacity Data not Considered
	Programs Offered	Capacity of Programs	
Secondary Schools Serving Region	61.4	43.5	12.0
Postsecondary Schools Serving Region	53.2	34.7	18.9
Proprietary Schools With Vocational Programs	27.7	16.8	43.3
Private, Non-profit Training Facilities	21.6	13.2	49.3
Manpower (CETA) Skill Centers, Etc.	26.8	16.1	43.6
Hospital Teaching Programs	33.9	21.4	36.3
Union Training Programs	24.8	14.7	45.8
Industrial Training Programs	33.0	19.0	37.4

Table IX-3

Alternative Sources of Vocational Resources
Considered in Identifying Program Need
(Percent of Institutions Responding)
-Postsecondary Institutions-

Vocational Education and Training Resources	Information Was Sought On		Program and Capacity Data not Considered
	Programs Offered	Capacity of Programs	
Secondary Schools Serving Region	71.6	46.5	14.7
Postsecondary Schools Serving Region	76.8	58.1	10.0
Proprietary Schools With Vocational Programs	47.6	32.2	38.3
Private, Non-profit Training Facilities	43.9	30.6	40.2
Manpower (CETA) Skill Centers, Etc.	44.4	29.9	39.4
Hospital Teaching Programs	59.6	44.1	24.8
Union Training Programs	42.9	27.2	43.2
Industrial Training Programs	54.1	32.9	31.6

In Table IX-1, "student interest" was identified as one of the highest priority factors. However, few of the 56 States and Territories reported that a student interest survey -- or other study of student choice preference -- was required for the approval of a new facility. Similarly, over 70 percent of the responses reported that they did not formally conduct a study of student interest and/or community needs prior to planning their new facilities.

Capital and operating costs of vocational education programs significantly exceed those of general education programs -- as well as differing significantly among vocational education programs. Therefore, the relatively low priority given to the cost of alternative programs in selecting programs to be included in a new facility is significant. Not only were capital costs and program operating costs identified as among the lowest priority planning factors, but only 55.6 percent of the responding institutions reported that consideration had been given to the differences in the costs of different programs in the selection of programs to be offered in their new facilities.

Program Review Practices

As previously noted, planning is an ongoing process. The efficient use of vocational education facilities and resources is as much a function of the practices employed in the ongoing review of program demand as are the activities undertaken in new facility and program planning.

Table IX-4 summarizes the provisions that exist for the ongoing review of program demand, while Tables IX-5 and IX-6 identify criteria that are applied in the decision to terminate a program of vocational education (Table IX-5), and factors that are reported as preventing program termination (Table IX-6).

As shown in Table IX-4, approximately 23 percent (weighted average) of all secondary schools and eight percent of all postsecondary institutions reported conducting no formal review of program demand. The average frequency with which program demand reviews are conducted is between three and four years for both secondary and postsecondary institutions; however, a significant difference may be noted between different classes of institutions.

Significantly, program enrollments and placement percentages are the most frequently used factors in assessing program demand. However, the frequency with which institutions report securing other data in reviewing program demand does not correspond to the priorities assigned to data sources used in planning as reported in Table IX-1.

While program placements are cited (Table IX-4) as the second most frequently used factor in studies of program demand, they are the least frequently used basis for program termination (Table IX-5). Also, while program

Table IX-4

Frequency of Program Demand Review and Data/Information Used in Program Review (By Percent of Institutions Responding)

School Type		No Formal Review Program	Average Frequency of Review (Years)	Data/Information Used: Manpower Projections	Enrollments in Individual Programs	Placement Percentages	Student Interest Surveys	Input From Community	Craft/ Advisory Committee
Comprehensive High School	Single District	26.1	3.30	60.5	89.7	51.2	85.4	78.7	72.3
	Regional	20.2	4.07	67.6	90.1	65.4	84.6	80.8	82.4
Vocational High School	Single District	24.5	3.50	78.7	91.5	68.1	68.1	89.4	89.4
	Regional	10.6	4.28	92.9	92.9	89.3	82.1	84.5	96.4
Vocational Center	Single District	16.7	3.25	83.3	88.7	82.7	84.0	81.3	88.0
	Regional	11.5	2.89	83.9	92.2	84.5	85.2	86.7	95.4
Area Vocational School		5.6	3.22	93.4	95.2	97.6	70.7	91.0	95.8
Technical Institute		14.4	3.66	91.6	97.9	89.5	76.8	91.6	94.7
Community College		8.6	3.42	94.0	97.1	85.3	75.8	93.0	96.3

Table IX-5

Criteria for Program Termination (By Percent of Institutions Responding)

Program Termination Criteria	Institutions Type: Secondary Schools	Postsecondary Institutions
None	38.3	28.1
Placement Rates	24.4	36.5
Teaching Loads	27.2	34.3
Enrollment Levels	80.0	71.3
Budget	64.9	77.6

costs were reportedly the least significant factor in program selection, this is the second most frequently cited basis for program termination.

The consequences of assigning low planning priority to program costs are further demonstrated by Table IX-6 where "prior investments" are shown to be the most frequently cited factor preventing program termination.

Table IX-6

Factors Preventing Program Termination
(By Percent of Institutions Reporting)

Program Termination Prevention Factor	Institutions Type	
	Secondary Schools	Postsecondary Institutions
Teacher Tenure	18.1	23.4
Prior Investments	34.3	31.3
Student Objections	26.0	24.0
Community Objections	27.2	27.3

Table IX-6 further demonstrates the importance of student interest and community desires in program selection and retention -- over 25 percent of the responding institutions reported these variables as factors preventing program termination. Teacher tenure, however, was the least frequently reported factor preventing program termination.

Factors Affecting Operating Schedules and Use of Alternative Facility Sources

In addition to the general study of issues that affected program planning and decision-making (discussed in the preceding topics), a preliminary study was made of the factors affecting two aspects of facility utilization. Two issues were specifically addressed:

- Why alternative operating schedules (evening, Saturday, and summer sessions) were not used.
- Why alternative sources of facilities were not used.

These two issues are reviewed in the following sections.

Operating Schedules

Tables IX-7 and IX-8 summarize the reasons given by secondary and postsecondary institutions for not offering instructional programs during extended day, evening, Saturday, and summer schedules.

Table IX-7

Reasons for Non-Use of Extended Day, Evening, Saturday, and Summer Operating Schedules (By Percent of Institutions Responding) -Secondary Schools-

Activities	Reasons Sessions Not Offered:				Percent of Secondary Schools Not Offering Schedule Indicated
	Staffing Not Available	Operating Funds Not Available	Insufficient Demand	Never Considered	
Extended Day, Afternoon Session	11.7	30.8	71.2	35.6	56.8
Evening Program	19.1	6.28	49.2	31.0	25.2
Saturday	6.5	35.6	43.7	20.8	57.0
Summer	5.7	24.3	65.8	10.5	39.8

Table IX-8

Reasons for Non-Use of Extended Day, Evening, Saturday, and Summer Operating Schedules (By Percent of Institutions Responding) -Postsecondary Schools-

Activities	Reasons Sessions Not Offered:				Percent of Secondary Schools Not Offering Schedule Indicated
	Staffing Not Available	Operating Funds Not Available	Insufficient Demand	Never Considered	
Extended Day, Afternoon Session	6.0	15.5	81.7	10	34.2
Evening Program	0.0	100.0	0.0	0.0	1.0
Saturday	7.8	10.7	75.1	13.3	40.5
Summer	24.3	32.5	38.6	20.9	4.2

As shown in these tables, the most significant factor affecting the offering of these schedules was "insufficient demand." The significance of this factor is particularly important when contrasted with the frequency with which operating funds are reported as the limiting factor, because the most frequently heard justification for the "limited" vocational education program availability is limited funding.

The "insufficient demand" noted by respondents is most reflective of student attitudes regarding the schedules when they are willing to attend school. If these preferences were to change, limited funding might become a real problem. This proposition, however, cannot be tested from available data.

Alternative Sources of Facilities

Tables IX-9 and IX-10 summarize the reasons given by responding - secondary and postsecondary institutions for not using each of seven alternative sources of facilities for their vocational education programs.

Table IX-9

Reasons for Non-Use of Alternative Sources of Vocational Facilities
(By Percent of Institutions Responding)
-Secondary Schools-

Alternatives	Considered but not used because:				
	Suitable Resources Were Not Available	Not Allowed by State Law	Not Funded by State Law	Not Desired by Community	Considered Too Expensive
Conversion of a Facility That Was Already the Property of the School System	51.8	4.8	11.1	28.2	42.9
The Purchase and Conversion of a Facility (Other than School System Property)	47.1	3.9	15.4	18.6	52.0
The Purchase of Services from a Proprietary School	50.8	2.4	6.5	21.0	33.1
Shared Space with a Non-Educational Institution (Hospital, Military Training Facility, etc.)	61.1	3.6	5.7	16.1	12.9
Rental or Lease of a Facility	53.9	5.4	10.7	18.5	41.2
Facility Constructed for School System Under a Lease/ Purchase Agreement	33.1	7.9	11.0	22.8	57.5

Table IX-10

Reasons for Non-Use of Alternative Sources of Vocational Facilities
(By Percent of Institutions Responding)
-Postsecondary Schools-

Alternatives	Considered but not used because:				
	Suitable Resources Were Not Available	Not Allowed by State Law	Not Funded by State Law	Not Desired by Community	Considered Too Expensive
Conversion of a Facility That Was Already the Property of the School System	59.2	4.0	14.5	13.2	35.5
The Purchase and Conversion of a Facility (Other than School System Property)	52.0	3.8	21.5	27.9	86.1
The Purchase of Services from a Proprietary School	56.0	8.0	6.0	14.3	26.5
Shared Space with a Non-Educational Institution (Hospital, Military Training Facility, etc.)	69.0	0.0	8.0	16.0	18.0
Rental or Lease of a Facility	65.5	4.6	13.9	12.6	40.2
Facility Constructed for School System Under a Lease/ Purchase Agreement	29.5	23.1	11.5	19.2	43.6

As shown in these tables, the most commonly cited reason for the non-use of the alternative facility sources listed is the limited availability of suitable alternative resources. This finding is consistent with the finding that almost 70 percent of the institutions surveyed are located in areas of under 100,000 population (52 percent in areas of under 25,000 population) where the alternative sources of facilities may not be generally available.

The relative frequency with which the expense associated with the use of facility alternatives identified was reported as justification for their non-use. While no effort was made to conduct a followup to determine what is considered "too expensive," the general literature dealing with construction vs. renovation costs -- as well as literature relating to the cost of operating vocational education programs -- does not suggest that the respondents' positions can generally be substantiated -- at least not with the frequency represented by the responses reported.

Perhaps the most interesting data reported in Tables IX-9 and IX-10, however, is the extent to which State legislation and policy affect the use of alternative resources. While the frequency with which these factors inhibit the use of alternatives is generally low, the magnitude of these factors is significant. It is an important reminder of the State's impact on the operation of local vocational education programs.